

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,390, Vol. 53.

June 17, 1882.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

EGYPT.

THE outbreak at Alexandria on Sunday last was a very grave political event. It was the turning-point in current Egyptian history, and put an end once for all to the state of things previously existing. In its origin it was so far fortuitous that no one probably had arranged that it should occur at the particular time and in the particular place when and where it did occur. But that is all. The natives had been prepared to rise against the Europeans; they had been taught that Europeans must be got out of the country, and had seen that the great apostle of the doctrine remained master, whatever happened; they had ascertained, by practical experience, that the allied fleets could do nothing to protect European life and property. A casual conflict between some Arabs and Levantines gave the opportunity which was expected and desired. Instantly natives in different parts of Alexandria began to beat Europeans, to kill Europeans, and to plunder Europeans. Everything went on to the satisfaction of the rioters; the military police aided them in these operations, bayonetting numbers of helpless fugitives; and the army was kept back for hours calmly surveying the scene, until at last those who direct the army thought that enough had been done, and the troops put an end to the riot. Nothing, however, could efface from the memory of the Egyptians that they had dragged from his carriage an English Consul and beaten him; that they had murdered several Englishmen, and struck and insulted many other Englishmen; and that they had done this under the eyes of an English Admiral who had been sent to Alexandria to protect his countrymen. Nothing, again, could efface from the memory of all Europeans that a massacre had taken place, and that the circumstances of the massacre had shown that there was no kind of security that a new outbreak would not take place. A very natural panic set in, and Europeans of all nations left all they possessed, and crowded into the few ships which were at hand to carry them out of the country. In Egyptian politics the effect of this successful rising was immediately apparent. ARABI, Dervish, and the KHEDIVE met in council, and the triumvirate partitioned the government of Egypt. ARABI was to be left at Cairo as complete master of the capital, and of the interior, engaging, on the other hand, that the troops at Alexandria should obey the KHEDIVE and Dervish until further notice. The Khedival and Turkish portion of the Government got away as quickly as possible to Alexandria, and has been followed by all the machinery of administration. All the official world has abandoned Cairo, and has repaired to do nothing at Alexandria, in attendance on a KHEDIVE who can also do nothing, and in concert with Dervish, who can do one thing, and no more. He can try earnestly and resolutely, as he appears to be trying, to inspire the belief that it will be safer, on the whole, for the leaders of the troops at Alexandria to avoid for the moment an open rapture with the representative of the SULTAN. This is the present state of things, and this is the one solitary prospect of safety for the Europeans who are still in Egypt. No European Power can or will protect them; but there is left a chance that ARABI, finding that, instead of being treated as a rebel, he has been admitted to a more than equal share in government, and is master of the capital and the interior, may think that he has more to gain than to lose by screening the few helpless Europeans in his power, and the further

chance that Dervish may continue to persuade the officers of Alexandria that, if they allow or participate in a further massacre, the vengeance of the SULTAN will some day overtake them.

The first question which arises in the mind of every Englishman is what is our own Government going to do? What is the line which England ought to take in view of an English Consul publicly beaten and wounded, Englishmen massacred, English property plundered, and the demands of England contemptuously rejected? It may also be added that England has placed itself under a very heavy responsibility to the rest of Europe. The subjects of the Powers whom England asked to keep in the background are being killed and plundered because England had its wishes or claims granted, and took the lead in dealing with Egypt. What, then, is our Government going to do, in face of its very grave responsibility to England and to Europe? The Government altogether declines to answer. It knows as little as possible of what is going on in Egypt. It treats the outbreak of Sunday as a poor little local affair, in which no great harm was done, to which no political interest attaches, and which was ended in a moment by the intervention of the admirable Egyptian soldiery. It wants time to find out whether ARABI was or was not admitted to the Council by which the Government was partitioned. It is very unhappy when people point out that the greater part of our ironclads stay outside the harbour because they cannot get in. It will not believe that any large number of British subjects really wish to leave a country like Egypt, where they are all so happy and safe under British protection. When it is very urgently pressed to disclose what it is going to do now, it replies that in a week or ten days Parliament will learn what it thought it was going to do a couple of months ago. This course, which on the surface seems merely designed to baffle or avert Parliamentary criticism, and which shocks the legitimate desire of the country to know what it is to which it is being committed, is justifiable or unjustifiable according as the Government means or does not mean to do something which will show that the arm of England, which is slowly raised, strikes hard when it does strike. If the Government is resolved to act so that the world may know that, when her honour is at stake and her gravest interests are seriously imperilled, England will, if necessary, act for herself and by herself, the course taken by the Government this week may have been a prudent course. To minimize everything, to seem hopelessly ignorant, and to refer inquirers to unpublished papers dealing with a totally different state of affairs, is one of the legitimate arts of government when a Government in a great crisis intends to do something the effect and success of which might be impaired if all the world were warned beforehand of what was coming. If the Government merely mean to let things drift, to trust to ARABI, to trust to Dervish, to coax the SULTAN, and start talk at a Conference, the present Ministerial reticence sinks into a party device for delaying Parliamentary exposure of its hesitation and bewilderment.

There are one or two reflections of considerable importance which recent events suggest. In the first place, it is now impossible that the *status quo* should be restored. Nothing can now bring back the Egypt in which a loyal Khedive worked with the Western Powers to govern a peaceful and prosperous country, and every one felt safe

under the protection of the great nations who had only to speak a word to make every one fall prostrate before them; while the SULTAN was told to keep at a respectful distance, and not meddle in matters that did not concern him. The whole of this arrangement depended on the conviction that England always got what it wished, and on the fear which the name of England inspired. A year ago every Egyptian believed that instant death would await any one who touched a hair of an Englishman's head; an English Consul was so sacred a being that even to insult a Consul's janissary was looked on as a monstrous and awful crime. This conviction and this fear have now been uprooted. The natives have learnt that Englishmen may be killed with impunity, and that an English Consul may be beaten like the humblest fellah. No calling in of Turks can efface the impression which recent events have produced. Even if security is restored, Englishmen will be under Turkish and not under English protection, and the safety they will enjoy will be the safety of contempt. A Conference may be induced to impose some limitations on Turkish intervention; but it will be for all the Powers if they please, and as long as they choose, to make Turkey fulfil the obligations it undertakes. England will be only one Power among many, and there can be no claim on the part of England to exercise a primacy in regulating the affairs of Egypt when it has once had to confess that it has had its claim allowed and could make no use of it. An Egypt even with TEWFIK restored, but with a Turkish army acting under the general guidance of Powers having for the most part interests antagonistic to those of England, and with Englishmen living uneasily under Turkish protection, would not be the Egypt of the *status quo*, but a new Egypt with which every sensible Englishman would have as little to do as possible. In the next place, recent events have shown, or at least have tended to show, how divergent may be the Egyptian interests in England and France. It has been allowed that ARABI has nothing but bad words for England and good words for France. French officials ostentatiously consort with the military leaders. The French Consul-General stays with ARABI at Cairo when the English Consul-General follows the KHEDIVE to Alexandria. By some mysterious accident Frenchmen appear to have been unmolested in the outbreak at Alexandria. In many ways it has become manifest that there is an informal, and perhaps very vague, alliance between the French and ARABI which does not exist between the English and the successful rebel who has defied every one, gained the army, led the country, and has even, it is said, been elevated to the rank of a long-expected *MESSIAH* by his wondering and fanatical countrymen. The French sympathy with ARABI is by no means inexplicable. It is almost entirely as a North African Power that France is interested in Egypt, and the French may think it much better for them that there should be an independent Arab Government in Egypt than that there should be a Turkish intervention, and the supremacy of the SULTAN over North Africa should seem to be restored. Another Tunis in Egypt might not much hurt France, and France might hope to exact a respectful attention to its wishes from an independent Egypt, which it knows to be very difficult to exact from the SULTAN even now, and which it would be much more difficult to exact from a SULTAN seated in triumph at Cairo.

IRELAND.

MR. TREVELYAN'S exaggerated language on the subject of evictions is less surprising than deplorable. It may be set down to any of three several causes. It may be pure sentiment; it may be the result of the unchastened and apparently irresistible delight in lecturing a landowner which seems to be to a certain class of modern Liberal what "wopping a lord" was to THACKERAY'S bargee; or, finally, and not improbably, it may have been an overture of peace to the Irish members, and an attempt to show that the new CHIEF SECRETARY is not even as the old. Whatever was the cause of it, it was and remains deplorable, even though Mr. TREVELYAN's comparatively subordinate position deprives it of the importance it would have had in the mouth of a Cabinet Minister. It is little to say that it is a monstrous injustice to call any man cruel and unpatriotic for calling in, after much long-suffering, his just debts, and that

the injustice is still more monstrous when the right which he exercises has been expressly and deliberately reserved to him by recent legislation, which has stripped him of other rights. Arguments from justice have ceased to have any meaning in connexion with the policy of Mr. TREVELYAN'S superiors towards Ireland. But a politician of some intelligence might have been expected to see that, on the assumptions of the Land Act itself, a stable and prosperous Ireland absolutely requires eviction on no inconsiderable scale. No permanent relation between landlord and tenant, even between rent-charger and occupier, can be attained so long as any considerable portion of the tenantry is of the thriftless, reckless class which looks to accident and agitation to pay its debts. The sore of eviction, painful as it may be, is exactly one of those afflictions the premature arresting of which can only be hurtful, and may be fatal, to the constitution. Mr. GLADSTONE, to do him justice, has not yet given any adherence to the rhetoric of his IRISH SECRETARY; but division of parts in this fashion is not unknown in Parliamentary history. The real facts about eviction came out unpleasantly enough for the Land Leaguers in reply to the questions they asked with a view of throwing obloquy on their last victim. Some of Mr. BOURKE'S tenants owed the dead man seven years' rent—it is needless to say that there was no distress in Ireland in 1875—they refused even to make an offer of composition, and they are understood to have believed that the Land League would save them from having to pay. No Land Act, no Arrears Bill, no violation whatever of the ordinary laws of political economy, will ever permanently reduce to order a country which contains any large number of such tenants, and eviction is the only possible remedy.

The failure to comprehend these very simple facts which is shown by Mr. TREVELYAN'S remarks, and by the shrill echoes of those remarks in the Radical press, brings out the wisdom of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE'S emphasis at St. James's Hall on the paramount necessity of informing modern political opinion. The present is supposed to be a period of enlightenment; but it is probable—it certainly would appear from their conduct—that at no time did certain party politicians, from the highest to the lowest class, act less on actual knowledge of facts. That the Ireland and the Irish of English Liberals are as purely imaginary as the fancy communities of any Utopist is certain. But the same substitution of ideas for facts appears in detail as well as in the gross. Lord GRANVILLE'S disposal of the description of the British fleet at Alexandria as "helpless and passive" by a simple denial of the fact comes agreeably to supplement Mr. GLADSTONE'S complaint, more in sorrow than in anger, of the indecency of talking to him of a treaty of Kilmainham when it is known that he denies the existence of any treaty. That the authority of that fleet has been defied and insulted without its making any sort of response is nothing to Lord GRANVILLE; that the protocols of that treaty have been read to the House of Commons is nothing to Mr. GLADSTONE. Certain French poets, taking their cue from M. VICTOR HUGO, are wont to discourse mystically on "le Verbe," on the power, beauty, and mystery of human language. With HER MAJESTY'S present Ministers certain kinds of language, at any rate, seem to have altogether superhuman power. The unsupported denials of Mr. GLADSTONE and Lord GRANVILLE abolish by their mere pronunciation all existing facts. The solemn assertion of Mr. TREVELYAN that eviction is cruel and unpatriotic establishes its cruelty and its want of patriotism. The only objection that can be taken to Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE'S prescription is that it is anything but easy to carry out. For the information of large masses of public opinion can only be effected by words spoken or written; and this simply hands over the prize to the most audacious asserter or denier. At present it can hardly be disputed on which side the most audacious asserters and deniers are to be found.

The general attitude of the Government on the Prevention of Crime Bill continues to be partly, but by no means wholly, satisfactory. Indeed in some respects, instead of, in commercial phrase, "ruling harder" than it did last week, it rules softer. Yet the concessions which have been made are still not of vital importance, though one or two of them have been obviously in the direction of providing gaps for the Land League to drive its coach through. The really unsatisfactory part of the matter, however, is, as it was last week, the incomprehensible insensibility of the Government to the value of time.

Either the Prevention of Crime Bill will strengthen the hands of the authorities in preventing and punishing such crimes as the murder of Mr. BOURKE, or it will not. It is not to the present purpose to decide which of these two results is the more likely. But in any case expedition in getting it to work is clearly of the very first necessity. This expedition Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues for some reason or other will not use. In the face of obstruction, which is not the less obstructive because two members do not read Blue-books (as on a celebrated occasion) for six hours at a stretch, they handsomely remark that no obstruction is taking place. When the familiar duet of motions to report progress, and motions that the Chairman do leave the Chair, begins, they protest mildly, sigh, and give way. Indirectly they contribute themselves to the delay of the Bill by the obstinate and reiterated refusal not so much to give information about another subject of the day, as to adopt what may be called the course of taking the House into their confidence in refusing to give it. To allow even a subordinate official in Mr. TREVELYAN's peculiar position to make such an utterance as that which has been already commented on, and yet not to take greater pains to expedite the passage of the Prevention of Crime Bill, is a very singular course of conduct. It awakes unpleasant memories of not dissimilar action on the part of the Government before, and it is capable of being construed as a sort of mute appeal to have their hands once more forced. Whether Irish magistrates are to sit singly or in pairs; whether, if they sit in pairs, one is to be a trained lawyer or not; whether the taking possession of another's land must be "forcible" or not; whether such and such a risk is to be run by any one guilty of an assault, or only by some one guilty of an aggravated assault, are all very pretty points of academic discussion. It would be quite proper to discuss them in settling the code of the City of the Sun, or in drawing up the police regulations of a province in Ejuxria. But one looks through these debates in vain for any sign on the part of the Government of a comprehension of the fact they have to deal with a set of men who want to have the land of Ireland for nothing in the first place; to separate Ireland from England in the second; and who are carrying out these two designs from day to day by murdering, mutilating, or ruining those who stand in the way of them. It has been pointed out that it is beside the question to argue that the Bill will not prevent the attainment of these objects or the commission of the crimes by which they are sought to be attained. The Government contention is that it will, and they are bound to act accordingly. They do not so act, and that is the grievous fault of their present conduct.

PRINCE BISMARCK.

THE rejection of the Tobacco Monopoly Bill by the German Parliament had been anticipated, but German calculations scarcely soared so far as to dream of a majority against the Bill of 276 to 43. Prince BISMARCK clung to the Bill, not only because it was the keystone of his new financial system, but because it served him as a test of what by his own strength of will and indomitable resolution he could force on the German people. He has done everything he could to get the Bill through, and yet in the end he has found arrayed against him, not only all the parties which sometimes go with him and sometimes go against him, but a large section of his habitual supporters. The tiny minority which remained faithful to him was only a fraction of the Conservative party on which he can ordinarily rely. He induced his venerable master to inform the Parliament that he could not go to his grave in peace unless tobacco was sold by the Government and no one else; and subsequently he pushed the Bill through the Federal Council by using the overwhelming strength of Prussian votes against the resistance of the minor States. These were, however, his only successes. His own pet institution, the extra-Parliamentary Council of experts, boldly denounced the scheme, and he had at an early period of the struggle to abandon all hope of coaxing the Clerical party to give him his Tobacco Bill in return for ecclesiastical concessions. The Parliamentary Committee to which the Bill was referred reported strongly against it, and when Parliament was to make its final decision, he can have had no hope of reversing the judgment of the

Committee. But, if he could not carry his Bill, he could seize an opportunity of defying the Parliament, deriding his assailants, and expounding his general political views. His defence of the measure itself occupied only a small portion of the two long and fiery speeches which his distressing state of health permitted him to make; and both in what he said for the Bill, and in what his numerous adversaries said against it, there is an apparent absence of any very cogent reason for the great importance which he attached to its being accepted and his opponents to its being rejected. Some kinds of direct taxation press heavily on the poor, and Prince BISMARCK wished to relieve these sufferers by substituting for the direct taxes they pay a new kind of indirect taxation. The present tobacco duties bring in so much, the tobacco monopoly would bring in so much more, and why should not the poor payer of direct taxes benefit by the surplus? Prince BISMARCK was not nominally asking for more money for Imperial purposes; he was only asking that taxes of an oppressive and unpopular kind should be replaced by taxes that would be paid with greater readiness and ease. Both in France and in Austria there is a Government monopoly of tobacco; and Germany might, as Prince BISMARCK suggested, get on as comfortably as Frenchmen and Austrians do, if they too had to go for their tobacco to a Government shop. Some of his adversaries replied that tobacco was largely grown in Germany, and that many small industries had sprung into existence for the purpose of preparing and manufacturing tobacco, which would be crushed if the Bill was carried. Others insisted that the Bill was a further plunge into the abyss of Protection, or that the best way of relieving the poor payers of direct taxes was to spend less on those objects to which the Imperial funds are devoted. Both the PRINCE and his opponents kept in the background what to him was the great merit, and to them was the great demerit, of the Bill—that a tobacco monopoly in the hands of Prussia would be a most powerful means of making the Empire at home in every little State, and diminishing local independence.

It was not what he said about tobacco, but what he said in his authoritative and discursive way about Parliaments, Germany, and himself, that made Prince BISMARCK's speeches really interesting. He knew he was going to suffer a Parliamentary defeat, and he thought it might be useful if he explained to those who were going to inflict the defeat on him what he thought of adverse Parliamentary votes. In countries where the Parliamentary system is complete, it is taken for granted that a Ministry defeated on a test question will either resign, and make room for a new Ministry in better harmony with the views of the Parliamentary majority, or will appeal to the country. Prince BISMARCK has sedulously applied his mind to the study of contemporary history, and has come to the conclusion that this scheme of government is certainly impossible in Germany, and may probably become impossible elsewhere before long. The Parliamentary system depends on the existence of two parties, each ready to replace the other, and led by men practically acquainted with the art of conducting the great affairs of State, but both equally bent on maintaining the broad lines of national policy. If this is an indispensable condition of successful Parliamentary government, it cannot be fulfilled in Germany. There is no party either ready or fit to replace the party of Prince BISMARCK, and there is no Parliamentary section which, if placed in office, could be trusted to persevere in the difficult and onerous task of building up the German Empire. Even in England, where the Parliamentary system has attained its greatest perfection, it has begun to break down. There are no longer two parties, and two only, answering to Prince BISMARCK's description of what Parliamentary parties ought to be. "My colleague GLADSTONE," as he called our wonderful Premier, has found this to his cost. He finds himself confronted with a third party, violent, audacious, reckless, and totally opposed to the traditional policy of England. In Austria Prince BISMARCK finds the same process going on. The Government cannot get a coherent and rational majority to face a coherent and rational minority. And the confusion which may in time show itself in England or Austria would be certain, in Prince BISMARCK's opinion, to show itself from the outset in Germany. It is scarcely possible for one human being to have a worse opinion of another than Prince

BISMARCK has of his opponents, and especially of his Liberal opponents. They are ludicrously and hopelessly unfit to govern, and cannot be allowed to govern. For him, therefore, a Parliamentary defeat is of very little consequence. He wants a Bill carried, he cannot get it carried, and there is an end of the matter. He will go on just as he went on before. In conjunction with the EMPEROR, he will govern Germany with or without a tobacco monopoly, for he alone of Germans is fit to govern. This his opponents call absolutism; he calls it patriotism; and he is perfectly indifferent whether outsiders choose to use one phrase or the other.

Prince BISMARCK, in talking of Germany and things German, never forgets or suffers his hearers to forget the place of Germany in Europe. He is never tired of warning his countrymen that they live in a state of great and imminent peril. Their danger comes both from their geographical position and from their own defects. They are in the centre, and are always exposed to coalitions attacking them from different sides. Prince BISMARCK says that he has been ceaselessly engaged for the last ten years in warding off such coalitions, and hitherto he has warded them off partly by good management, but principally by trading on the fears which the great German army inspires. What Prince BISMARCK implores his countrymen to understand is that the German Empire only exists because those who would like to crush it are afraid of it. It is, therefore, entirely impossible for him to hold out the slightest hope that he will permit any diminution of the strength and efficiency of the German army. Germany must find the men and the money that are wanted, and if it does not like a tobacco monopoly, it must tax itself to the proper amount in some other way. Nor can any German who studies passing events fail to see that Prince BISMARCK is perfectly right in saying that it is by the fear which he and the German army awaken that he is constantly winning successes and averting dangers. Within the last few days Germans have had the satisfaction of witnessing the fall of Count IGNATIEFF, and of seeing the adventurous politician who nearly embarked Russia in a war with Germany excluded from the councils of the Czar. Count IGNATIEFF's power was really at an end when Germany challenged Russia either to give up Panslavic crusades or to go to war, and Russia was very naturally frightened, and gave in. His formal dismissal only ratifies the change of feeling which Germany imposed on Russia. In the same way Prince BISMARCK can keep the meek and prudent Administration of M. DE FREYCINET in office, because the French nation is made to see that M. GAMBETTA might bring it into collision with an adversary it does not like to face. But to continue his successes Prince BISMARCK wants something more than men and money; he wants a stronger and heartier national spirit than he can find. There is an ardour for the German Empire which he finds lacking, and a zeal for little interests which he finds excessive. It was principally as a means of awakening the former and repressing the latter that he thought his Tobacco Bill of great national importance. The Parliament has rejected his Bill; but if he cannot get his countrymen to smoke as he wishes, he can at least try to get them to think as he wishes, and, to teach them how to think rightly, he employs the plainest and frankest language at his command.

PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS.

AMONG many impediments to the transaction of Parliamentary business is the notorious abuse of the practice of asking questions. The evil might be mitigated by judicious modifications of the Standing Orders, but it could scarcely be altogether abated. Many of the so-called questions are elaborate statements of real or supposed grievances, with a few words at the end which serve the purpose of a note of interrogation. An Irish, or even an English, member tells a story two or three paragraphs long, and then asks a Minister whether his attention has been called to the case, and whether he proposes to apply a remedy. The whole object of the proceeding is to inform the House, with more or less conformity to truth, that a certain transaction has illustrated the opinions of the questioner. More speculative or theoretical inquiries are in a similar manner only made for the purpose of asserting or of supporting by argument some abstract

proposition. One of the few supporters of the paradox of bimetallism lately expatiated on the alleged expediency of "restoring silver everywhere to its former 'monetary functions,'" and asserted that the confusion which he attributed to the use of a gold standard was seriously detrimental to commerce. For the purpose, according to the hackneyed phrase, of putting himself in order, he finally asked the SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA whether the Monetary Conference was likely soon to reassemble. The expediency or possibility of introducing a double standard might perhaps be worth discussing if the House had nothing better to do; but it is idle to encumber the Notice Paper with a speech condensed into the preamble of a question. A short answer to ill-timed inquiries tends to diminish the inconvenience; but, if it is habitually given, it tends to make a Minister unpopular.

On Monday last more than forty notices of motion and orders of the day had to be postponed till fifty-seven questions were asked and answered. It happened by an odd coincidence that one of the orders of the day was the celebrated resolution for closing debates to which Mr. GLADSTONE still clings with paternal tenderness. The list of questions might have suggested to an unprejudiced mind a doubt whether the compulsory termination of long debates was the most urgent need of the House of Commons. Mr. BROADHURST, who cannot be accused of any habitual propensity to obstruct business, headed the list with an inquiry whether the FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS would induce the Council of the Royal Botanic Society to admit the public into their gardens in the Regent's Park. It would have been more to the purpose to ask the members whether they would be likely to continue their subscriptions without deriving any benefit from their expenditure. It was obvious that the FIRST COMMISSIONER could give no satisfactory answer. Mr. MACKINTOSH then told a complicated story about the eviction of two small tenants in Ross-shire, and asked the LORD ADVOCATE whether such proceedings were legal. There is a strong probability that a landlord exercises a legal right when he ejects a tenant. If not, he is liable to damages and costs, and to the restoration of the tenancy which has been irregularly interrupted. The House of Commons can afford no redress to a tenant who has merely been treated with harshness; nor, indeed, is there any reason to believe an accusation, of which there is no proof but a second-hand recital. Two or three subsequent questions addressed to the CHIEF SECRETARY were perhaps less illegitimate, though, like Puritanic prayers, they purported to convey statements under the form of asking for information. Two members on opposite sides of the House accused certain Sub-Commissioners of acting as judges in cases where they were indirectly interested. It is highly probable that members of tribunals which have not commanded confidence or respect may have emancipated themselves from the scruples which are entertained by the higher class of judges in strict conformity with the law. Unfortunately those who remonstrate against improper conduct by means of Parliamentary questions have no means of giving effect to their objections. Mr. TREVELYAN is ready, skilful, and courteous in replying to long strings of questions; but neither he nor any other Minister can deal conveniently with statements which are made under an oblique grammatical construction. He can at most only state that a Sub-Commissioner ought not to hear cases in which his relations are interested, or that a seed-merchant promoted to a Sub-Commissionership might as well not allow his traveller to solicit orders from farmers at the same place and time at which the principal is sitting as a judge. One of the most singular questions in the list was asked by Mr. MOLLOY. It is barely possible that his implied assertions may be well founded; but it is unfortunate that no one should be responsible for charges which, if they are not true, are grossly calumnious. Mr. MOLLOY wished to know whether a certain head-constable threatened to shoot the people at a meeting if they interfered with his taking notes. The accused officer might be more excusable for declaring "that he does not care about any questions relating to his conduct being asked in Parliament, and that he will continue to act as he may desire." It is but too probable that a head-constable, or any other official person, may feel but a qualified respect for Mr. MOLLOY and his questions. If there is any foundation for the story, it must be assumed that the threat of a series of questions had been employed to deter the constable from the discharge of his duty.

MR. HEALY was, of course, not ashamed to inquire whether any part of the reward voted to the Constabulary would be paid to the officers and men in Clare, Mayo, and Kilkenny against whom verdicts of wilful murder were returned by coroners' juries. No more atrocious instances of popular complicity with crime have occurred in the course of the atrocities promoted by Mr. HEALY's friends of the Land League. In several instances coroners' juries, including probably accomplices in attempts at murder, have found verdicts, not only against policemen, but against persons attacked, who have slain their assailants in self-defence. No stronger proof can be given of the necessity of the measure which Mr. HEALY and his associates have succeeded in delaying, with the assistance of three or four English lawyers who might have been expected to sympathize with victims rather than with murderers. In perverse frivolity another Irish member may have the credit of surpassing all his rivals. One of several questions was an indirect statement that a grant of 75*l.* to the late Lord MONTEAGLE to build a boys' school at Shanagolden was made in violation of the conditions on which grants are given by the Commissioners of National Education. The same member wished to know whether the site of the school was a plot of ground used as a commonage by the villagers. The late Lord MONTEAGLE, grandfather of the present peer, died at an advanced age many years ago. The present Commissioners of National Education are perhaps not the same who made the grant; and it is probable that the school has been advantageous to the inhabitants of Shanagolden. It is not desirable that the forms of the House of Commons should furnish facilities for the circulation of petty and spiteful provincial gossip. Another member objects to the employment of policemen to protect caretakers on the estate of the Marquess of WATERFORD, and he asserts that no outrages have occurred in the district during the course of the land agitation. If the implied statement had been true, the answer ought to have been that the proper authorities must be trusted with the distribution of the police force, and that the House of Commons has no means of controlling the details of administration. In the particular case the CHIEF SECRETARY was able to reply that more than a hundred outrages had been committed within the limits of time and place defined by the question. In all these cases there is what may be called by analogy to a recognized phrase an interrogative pregnant. The Minister to whom the question is addressed is expected to give a positive answer to a hypothetical inquiry. He would not be justified in assuming that the preliminary statement is true; and, if it is false or exaggerated, he cannot conveniently express an opinion on an imaginary case. It is indeed possible that in some instances useful information may be supplied to Parliament even in the form of a question; but the Government cannot openly distinguish the statements of respectable and responsible members from the fictions or vague rumours circulated by demagogues. One of the questions recited the terms of a notice calling on the inhabitants of a district to boycott certain persons; and it is improbable that the inquirer should have invented or imagined the document. The question whether the police have obtained any clue to the authors of the notice was evidently asked for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the notice. An examination of the questions addressed to the Ministers on any other day would show a similar result; and although the Irish members are perhaps the most conspicuous offenders, they only represent in larger type a common practice. It would perhaps be unadvisable to institute a preliminary censorship, which could only be exercised by the Speaker. Appeals to the good taste or good sense of the members who abuse the right of asking questions are confessedly useless and obsolete. There is fortunately a limit to the waste of time caused by irrelevant questions, inasmuch as they cannot be supported by a speech or discussed by hostile critics.

THE ELECTIONS IN BELGIUM.

A MIDST so much that is going on at home or in countries with which English interests are closely connected, it is not strange that no notice has been taken of the elections in Belgium. To most Englishmen, indeed, Belgian politics do not even afford matter for curiosity. They are confounded with those of the other small European

States which must for ever be content to follow humbly in the wake of their stronger neighbours. Yet the very absence of a foreign policy, and of the absorbing consideration which a foreign policy involves, has given the home affairs of Belgium an interest of their own. Much that has been going on during the last ten years in France might have been predicted by a careful observer of events in Belgium. The key to French politics during this period has been religion, and religion has been the key to Belgian politics for the last forty years. At the elections held on Tuesday half of each Chamber was returned, the provinces in which the contest took place being Eastern Flanders, Hainault, Liège, and Limburg. Besides this, new seats in each Chamber, consequent on the increase of the population, had to be filled up at Antwerp, Brussels, and Bruges. These provinces send up to the Legislature far more than their share of Liberal members. Before the elections of Tuesday the Liberal majority in the Chamber of Deputies was 14, while the Liberal majority in the Senate was only 4. But of the outgoing senators 23 were Liberals and 11 Catholics, and of the outgoing deputies 48 were Liberals and only 17 Catholics. Consequently the gain of a very few seats would have given the Catholics a majority in Parliament. The questions at issue between the Catholics and the Liberals were mainly two, Education and Parliamentary Reform. The Catholics, had they been victorious, would have proposed the immediate repeal of the Education law of 1879 and the substitution of a system closely resembling that which existed in England before the passing of Mr. FORSTER's Act. In England this system broke down by reason of its inapplicability to poor districts. The Education Department was ready to aid all schools equally, but where schools were most wanted there were no schools to be aided. In Belgium this difficulty does not exist. Since 1879 the whole country has been covered with voluntary schools. Girls' schools already existed in nearly every village, so that it was only necessary to add a school for boys. The Catholics have shown extraordinary zeal in this respect; and the result is that, partly from preference and partly from fear of the ecclesiastical and social disabilities incurred by parents who send their children to the communal schools, the latter are constantly left empty, and the children of the village attend the new voluntary school. Thus the repeal of the law of 1879 would not cause any practical inconvenience. Instead of the commune being compelled to provide sufficient schools for the children of its inhabitants, it would be allowed to subsidize the voluntary schools if it so pleased, and where it did not do so the voluntary schools would receive a grant of the money voted for education proportionate to the number of children in attendance. To the Belgian Liberals, imbued as they mostly are with the anti-clerical, if not anti-Catholic, feeling which characterizes Continental Liberalism, the very notion of such a step backwards is horrible, and, considering the present temper of the Belgian clergy, it is probable that the Liberals would be made to taste all the most unpleasing consequences that could be deduced from legislation of this kind. It is the misfortune of Belgium that the present Education law would work fairly well if the Liberals were only reasonable, that the Education law which the Catholics wish to put in its place would work fairly well if the Catholics were only reasonable, and that, the tone and attitude of parties being what they are, no Education law can be expected to work well.

Upon the question of Parliamentary reform the Government are at some disadvantage. In every Continental country except Italy the Liberals have a shibboleth which saves them the trouble of thinking who ought to vote and who ought not. Universal suffrage has been accepted as the beginning and end of their electoral creed, and to doubt the truth or wisdom of its decisions stamps the sceptic as a hopeless reactionist. But in Belgium, as in Italy, there is not only a restricted suffrage, but a suffrage which cannot be greatly extended without risk to the Liberal cause. The Prime Minister, M. FRÈRE ORMAN, in speaking the other day at Liège, said plainly that to adopt universal suffrage would mean the perpetual preponderance of the Catholic party in Belgium, and he intimated that though he was not opposed to some extension of the suffrage, it must be done with constant attention to the capacity of the elector. It is not unfair to suppose that readiness to vote for the Liberal candidate is an integral part of the Minister's conception of electoral

capacity. Still, though the dangers of universal suffrage are very patent to a Belgian Liberal, he is not happy when he is opposing it, and the extreme section of the party altogether refuse to oppose it. At one time it seemed that the division among the Liberals on this head might give the Catholics a majority. The imminent danger of this catastrophe has brought about a momentary union, and the result of Tuesday's elections has been favourable to the Liberal party. The Parliamentary majority in the Chamber of Deputies is increased to 18, and in the Senate to 7; and the new seats in Brussels and Antwerp have been carried by the Government. Still, the Catholics are not left without some consolation. For some years past they have not thought it worth while to contest Brussels; but this time they ventured to bring forward candidates for the three new seats, and they have polled a large number of votes. In this partial success they were greatly helped by the folly of their adversaries. Several of the Liberal candidates declared themselves in favour of an immediate revision of the Constitution with a view to the separation of Church and State, and at the meetings held to promote their return the strictest inquisition was instituted into the lives of the more moderate Liberals who asked the votes of the electors. One of these was charged with the high crime of sending his daughter to a convent school at Paris; another was asked if it was true that he allowed mass to be said in the chapel of his country house for the convenience of the villagers; a third was condemned because he had actually paid over to some religious institution a legacy which his mother had bequeathed to it. The more moderate and respectable members of the party were naturally not gratified by the absurdities committed in their name; and the Opposition hoped, no doubt, that in determining which candidate to vote for, many of them would prefer a moderate Catholic to an extreme Liberal. If the Liberal leaders in Brussels had not learnt wisdom at the last moment, this hope might not improbably have been fulfilled; and, even as it was, the numbers polled by the Catholics were doubtless increased by some secessions of this kind. But a Liberal defeat was avoided by judicious action on the part of the Liberal Association. Of the three candidates selected to contest the city, two were among the most moderate of those who had presented themselves, while the third, though he was in favour of the separation of Church and State, declared that he did not wish it done in a hurry.

In the present state of Belgium it is safer to congratulate the party that is defeated than the party that is successful. The dangers to which each is exposed comes far more from its own violence than from anything that is done to it by its opponents. If the Catholics had succeeded they would probably have alienated the moderate section of their supporters by the strong measures which they would have adopted against the Liberals. A Liberal victory, on the other hand, is an almost certain prelude to some new legislation which will offend moderate Liberals as much as the Catholic experiments in the same direction would have alienated moderate Catholics. It is difficult to believe, however, that in a country where it is admitted by a Liberal Prime Minister that the establishment of universal suffrage would be fatal to the Liberal party, the present distribution of power can long continue. If the present electorate is in positive antagonism to the majority of the population, it can hardly hope to sustain its claims to legislate on their behalf.

THE DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

THE joy of those that hanker after their wives' sisters was great over the division in the Lords on Monday, but it seems to have evaporated on a little examination of the matter. The same majority of four has before now sufficed to blast the hopes of the deceased wife's sister; and, small as it is, it is enough. The unwonted interest taken in the question by some illustrious personages who do not habitually vote in the House of Lords suffices on this occasion to account for the closeness of the division. It is somewhat tempting to meditate on the attitude which the political supporters of the Bill would have taken up had the division-list been differently composed, as well as on the certainty of their using the argument that the large amount of support given by the Peers was due to its being a "rich man's question," had it suited them to do so.

That it is a rich man's question no one acquainted with the subject will attempt to deny, otherwise than forensically. The whole agitation was begun, has been continued, and is supported by a few well-to-do breakers of the law, who have latterly found countenance and encouragement in what seems to be the only surviving principle of modern Liberalism—the principle that every one who is not a landlord, or a pious founder, or a devout member of the Church of England, is to do as he likes. The tell-tale character of the retrospective clause would require a much more adroit debater than Lord DALHOUSIE to conceal it. The incestuous proletarian who has succeeded the Irish Home Ruler as the chief object of Lord DALHOUSIE's affection is considerably less actual than his predecessor. But it may be quite certain that, if he exists, he cares very little about retrospective clauses. His entailed estates are rarely large, and he has not, as a rule, titles to be transmitted to a legitimate posterity only.

The occasion was really much more noticeable for the thoroughness of the argumentative defeat which the deceased wife's sister sustained than for her near approach to numerical success. The question is one of those hundred-times-debated ones in which the chief debaters of both Houses rarely care to engage; and it is perfectly believable that the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH had, as he says, no intention of speaking when he came down to the House. The Aristophanic feeling embodied in the exclamation "Thou hast given a handle!" is one, however, which a born debater can rarely resist; and Lord DALHOUSIE's speech bristled with handles enough to occupy BRIAREUS. It was, to say the least, not prudent to utter in the House of Lords, or indeed in either House of Parliament, the ingenuous sentiment, "Curse on all laws but those that love has made," and to take a stand upon "nature." Yet this is what Lord DALHOUSIE's statement that "as a matter of principle, in a question of marriage between two persons, freedom ought to be the rule" comes to, and that by no undue hyperbole of interpretation. In so far as this is an argument in favour of legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, it is in favour, as the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH pointed out, of sweeping away the table of affinities altogether. Indeed, it is as valid for polygamy as for deceased wives' sisters, and Lord DALHOUSIE ought already to have received a telegram of congratulation and thanks from Utah. Almost every argument in his speech was really as much in favour of marriages of consanguinity as of marriages of affinity. But perhaps Lord DALHOUSIE's most unlucky remark was his expression of opinion that "the picture of the dying wife, made unhappy in her last moments by the thought that her sister would succeed her in her husband's affections, was grotesque in the extreme." The peculiarity of temperament which sees grotesqueness in the affliction of a dying person, from whatever cause it proceeds, may be noted, but need not be dwelt on. But if grotesqueness and deathbeds are to be associated, was it not rather unfortunate that Lord DALHOUSIE should forget that he had just solemnly urged on the House of Lords his own knowledge of a baker's dozen of deathbeds on which the wife had published the banns of marriage between her husband and her sister? Which is the more grotesque, the working of the natural and terrible passion of jealousy at the most terrible moment of life, or the transformation of a deathbed into a Court of Love in which the hearts of men and women are adjudicated to each other by a third person *in extremis*? Those who do not hanker after their sisters-in-law may thank Lord DALHOUSIE for that word "grotesque."

The Bishop of PETERBOROUGH showed his usual judgment in fixing on those points in Lord DALHOUSIE's speech which were at once the weakest and the attack on which could be made most impressive. His denunciation of the free-love doctrine was forcible enough; but the argument which culminated in the witticism, likely to become historical, as to the eviction of the sister-in-law and her reinstatement as caretaker, was more forcible still. Like all really good jokes in debate, this witticism covers a solid argument. The Bill would literally evict sisters-in-law, and eviction in this case would literally be a sentence of death to the relationship. It is curious, though not unprecedented, that Lord DALHOUSIE, while talking glibly about the inability of law to check passion and the certainty of the generous and self-sacrificing nature of woman leading her to scorn the opinions of Mrs. GRUNDY, and so forth, should not have seen that he

was arguing against his own side. The great arguments against legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister are (apart from the Scriptural and historical argument) two. The first is that, into however close association men and women may be brought, the existence of a law and public opinion which designate them as persons between whom marriage is not possible suffices, except in a few cases, to prevent any desire for marriage arising. The other is that, when this restraint of opinion is relaxed, such a desire, in cases of close association, unless one person is exceptionally unattractive, does arise. If marriages with deceased wives' sisters are as numerous as they are, it is principally because, thanks to the incessant agitation kept up on the subject, the opinion has been to some small extent weakened. If the Bill passed it would be weakened still further, and there is little doubt that, supposing sisters-in-law continued to be "caretakers," marriages with them would take place in large numbers. That being the case, no woman who respected herself could possibly continue in the same house with her brother-in-law unless the marriage ceremony were actually gone through; and so, as the opponents of the Bill contend with perfect reason, a man would be compelled to marry his sister-in-law, or to give up her company and her services. Out of this there is no escape unless a kind of golden age is to be started in which any unmarried man and any unmarried woman may live in the same house and in each other's society without adult companions or chaperons, and with public opinion holding that it is sure to be all right. This will be a Saturnian reign, indeed—a period in which, as in the original Saturnian reign, no "mixture will be held a stain," and everybody will do exactly what he pleases; or else in which everybody will be guided by the abstract laws of virtue and morality without any pressure from law and public opinion. And yet somehow Lord DALHOUSIE is found talking about "the incomprehensible belief in the power of law to control human passions." His own belief appears to be the still more incomprehensible one, that human passions do not exist. Unfortunately they do; and so long as they do, the passing of this Bill will banish every decent woman from her dead sister's house and children until she re-enters it as a wife by courtesy. This bad result, and the less definite but far wider and more important result of the general weakening of the marriage tie, are, it seems, to be incurred cheerfully for the purpose of legally condoning the incontinence of certain persons wealthy enough to agitate, and by their agitation to draw to their side other persons who, but for it, would probably never have thought of their sisters-in-law otherwise than as of their sisters.

THE MOVEMENT OF AMERICAN POPULATION.

THE decennial rearrangement of the representation allowed to the several States of the American Union has been lately completed in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. The establishment of universal suffrage by modern legislation renders a periodical readjustment in accordance with the changes in the distribution of numerical strength both expedient and just; and a self-acting machinery is on all accounts preferable to appeals to the Legislature. The powers which are entrusted to the mass of the population are properly exercised by majorities. As soon as the results of a census are published, the number of votes to be assigned for a period of ten years to each State becomes a matter of simple calculation. As the whole number of representatives is not permanently fixed, the relative voting power of a State may possibly be diminished even when the number of its votes is increased. Before the census was taken, it was known that the growth of the Western and South-Western States entitled them to a considerable increase in the number of their representatives. More accurate inquiry has justified the general belief; and it is asserted, not as yet quite accurately, that the centre of political power is already transferred to the basin of the Mississippi. If the Constitution of the United States remains hereafter in this respect unchanged, the future preponderance of the Western States is obviously inevitable. California and the other regions beyond the Rocky Mountains are not, in popular language, included in the list of Western States. That their interests are in some respects different from those of all the other States has been proved by more than one practical assertion of

legislative independence. California retained a metallic currency during the long period of its suspension in the rest of the United States. The Homestead Law is equally disregarded on the Pacific slope, where the occupation and possession of land are regulated by local law or custom in accordance with the economic circumstances of the country. The other States wisely connive at seeming irregularities which might, if they were opposed, lead to disaffection, and possibly to secession. The great influence of California over central legislation was lately illustrated by the enactment of the anomalous law for preventing Chinese immigration.

Sanguine opponents of the American tariff persuade themselves that the increased power of the States in the Mississippi Valley will produce a reaction in favour of partial freedom of trade. It is known that the protectionist policy which has prevailed since the beginning of the Civil War has been principally promoted in their own interest by the manufacturers of Pennsylvania and New England. It is not less certain that protection inflicts heavy and uncompensated loss on the agricultural parts of the country. As their direct interest in foreign trade relates exclusively to corn and other exported commodities, they can obtain no benefit from import duties which increase the cost of almost every article which they have occasion to purchase. Their English and European customers would buy more of their produce if they were allowed to pay for it by the natural process of commercial exchange. It was on this ground that CORDEN and the Corn-law League laid the greatest stress in their struggle for the abolition of the Corn-laws. The Lancashire manufacturers subscribed largely to the agitation as an investment of their capital in the enterprise of opening or extending markets for their goods. A farmer in Illinois or Iowa may not be equally capable of understanding economic principles, but he can scarcely fail to perceive that he is paying tribute in more than one form to ironmasters and cotton-spinners. The more newly-settled States are more exclusively agricultural; but down to the present time they have displayed no general dissatisfaction with the perverse legislation of Northern and Eastern monopolists. The cotton States of the South have been deluded by the hope that they will establish manufactories of their own to compete successfully with the industry both of New England and of Europe; but it has in some cases been found that the increase caused by the tariff in the cost of materials and machinery far more than counterbalances the advantage of security against foreign competition. Although the preponderating interest of perhaps five-sixths of the whole population of the United States is opposed to a protective or prohibitive policy, there is in almost every State some petty industry which shares the prejudices of the great monopolists. It is at least certain that there has thus far been no organized opposition to the present tariff.

Future Legislatures will, like the present House of Representatives, probably be mainly guided by calculations of party interests. The Republicans who have controlled the policy of the United States for nearly a quarter of a century are almost without exception supporters of commercial protection. Their opposition to Free-trade is at the same time a cause and a consequence of their political organization. It is found more profitable to consult the wishes of the vigilant producer than the interests of the ignorant and careless consumer. On the other hand, voters who may be free from economic delusions support the system which has become a part of the party creed. Both Mr. GARFIELD and Mr. ARTHUR pledged themselves, either through conviction or on considerations of party expediency, to the maintenance of the tariff. The actual PRESIDENT has lately confined his nominations for a Commission of inquiry into the tariff exclusively to Protectionists. It is for Congress to judge whether he has complied with the intention of those who moved for the Commission. It may be taken for granted that he has, to the best of his judgment, satisfied the demands of his own section of the Republican party. A section of the Democratic body has always denounced the Protectionist policy, either on its own demerits or because it is supported by the Republicans; but the party as a whole is unwilling or unable to run the risk of offending popular prejudice and private interest. The manufacturers have adroitly affected a patriotic enthusiasm which seems to have imposed on the half-educated multitude of politicians. As the owners of Nevada silver mines a

year or two ago endeavoured to propagate a romantic attachment to the "dollar of the fathers," industrial monopolists affect to fear lest wages should be lowered to the European level. The ironmasters of Pennsylvania have indeed waited for a general strike before they admitted their workmen to a share of the profits which have accrued during a long period of prosperity; but, as soon as the struggle is over, the men will once more believe the assurance of the employers that the exclusion or discouragement of foreign imports is mainly intended to sustain the price of American labour. The injury which is suffered by foreign rivals is fortunately attended with a kind of compensation. America will never develop its inherent resources until it adopts a more rational policy. In neutral markets unfettered industry will almost always enjoy an advantage over the high-priced results of protected manufacture. It is not desirable that the Americans should prematurely discover a secret which would perhaps associate commercial expediency with patriotic prejudice.

The easy and regular adaptation of the American Constitution to the absolute and relative increase of population is, as might be expected, extolled as a proof of the advantages which result from pure democracy. It is certainly an enviable peculiarity of the United States that there can be no agitation for a Reform Bill, and no degradation of a franchise which it is impossible to lower. In England universal suffrage and equal electoral districts would undoubtedly suppress the nuisance of Reform Associations, or compel them to discover some other pretext for continuing their baleful activity; but a Parliament elected exclusively by the lowest class of the community would in England be supreme, except as far as it was controlled by delegates of the rabble organized after the Birmingham model. The founders of the American Union took effective precautions against the domination of numbers, though at that time universal suffrage was still unknown. The redistribution of votes directly affects only the House of Representatives, which is checked and controlled by the Senate. In the more important House, Rhode Island and Vermont have still an equal voice with New York, and, unless the Constitution is materially changed, they will not be outvoted by the millions who may hereafter crowd the Valley of the Mississippi. In ordinary times there is little or nothing for the House of Representatives to do, although it can originate or prevent new financial measures. The redistribution of votes will also operate in Presidential elections, but the complicated method of voting for Presidential electors sometimes enables a minority of the whole population to elect a President. Ten years hence it is not impossible that the growth of the Western and Pacific States may encourage their inhabitants to form independent opinions. As soon as they understand their own interests, they will attack and probably destroy the monopoly which now depends on the energy of Northern manufacturers, and on the fallacies which find favour with the Republican party. The Southern States, now finally emancipated from the control of negro voters, may probably be divided in commercial policy; but they will steadily support the Democratic party, whether or not its leaders may find it expedient to advocate the cause of commercial freedom.

THE STATUS OF FRENCH JUDGES.

WHETHER the 10th of June, 1882, will hereafter be included among the memorable days of the Third French Republic must depend upon the amount of discretion which the popular Chamber may at the eleventh hour show itself possessed of. The partisans of the defeated Ministry try to pin their hopes to something nearer and less uncertain than the late repentance of the deputies. They have suddenly become alive to the blessing of a Second Chamber. What does it matter, they say, that by two foolish votes the Deputies have made judges removable and elective? No doubt both decisions are extremely mischievous. If they could ever be carried out in practice, they would bring back some of the least satisfactory incidents of the First Republic, and go far to disgust the nation with its successor. But they never will be carried out in practice. France has a Senate as well as a Chamber of Deputies, and no measure can become law until it has gained the assent of both branches of the Legislature. All that the Chamber of Deputies has done is to postpone in-

definitely the accomplishment of that moderate reform which the Government wished to see effected. The Senate will have none of the Judiciary Bill in its present shape; the Chamber will have none of it in the shape suggested by the Cabinet; and the necessary result will be that the country will see nothing of the Bill in either shape. For once M. GAMBETTA is on the same side as the Government. He suspends his customary warfare with his successor in order to point out that this time the Chamber has made a mistake in defeating him. Even the rule "When in 'doubt vote against M. DE FREYCINET" has its exceptions; and, in M. GAMBETTA's opinion, the vote of Saturday last ought to have been one of them. He is not so cheerful in view of the coming defeat of the Judiciary Bill in the Senate as M. DE FREYCINET's friends have shown themselves, because it is not his cue to be severe on the Chamber when it shows itself more revolutionary than the Government. In making the judges removable, says his organ, the Chamber has wished to mark its determination to give the Republic a magistracy resting on a different basis from that on which the Monarchical magistracies have rested. In making the judges elective, it has wished to give the judiciary the same origin as that possessed by all other powers in our democratic State. The *République Française* does not condemn either of these aims. It only insists that, by pursuing them too eagerly, the Chamber will probably come short of them. If the Deputies had accepted the Government measure, the Senate would also have accepted it. As it is, the Deputies have put a much stronger measure in the place of that proposed by the Government, and the Senate will certainly reject it. It is difficult to see any foundation for this unusual confidence in the readiness of the Senate to retrieve the errors of the Chamber of Deputies. That the Judiciary Bill will be rejected if it is sent up this Session is likely enough. After being invited to take this course by the Government and by M. GAMBETTA, the Senate will naturally think that for once it may safely be guided by its own inclinations. But, if the Chamber stands by its votes, and again adopts a Bill to make judges removable and elective, what will the chance of its rejection by the Senate be worth then? Just nothing at all. By that time M. DE FREYCINET will have discovered that the Chamber is in earnest, and that if he does not do what the Deputies wish, M. GAMBETTA will be quite ready to do it, and he will easily draw the inference that it is his policy not to quarrel with his masters. The Senate will then have, as usual, to consider whether it prefers to accept a Bill which it dislikes, or to submit to a reconstruction which it still more dislikes; and there is not much question on which of these two alternatives their choice will fall.

The Government have themselves to thank for the position into which the question has drifted. When the MINISTER OF JUSTICE opposed the proposals of the Committee which had sat to consider, and as it turned out to remodel, the Ministerial Bill, he spoke with force and conviction. He disclaimed on behalf of his colleagues and himself all desire to see the judges reduced to the level of agents. The magistracy ought not to be dependent on the Government; it exists not to carry out the decisions of the Executive, but to maintain right and justice without reference, and if need be in opposition, to those decisions. The judges have been made irremovable, because it is only by making them irremovable that you can ensure that they shall be independent. But when M. HUMBERT came to reconcile his own proposal with the principles he had just laid down, he had really nothing to say. The defender of irremovability as the indispensable guarantee of independence was also the defender of a Bill to suspend this indispensable guarantee for a term of three months. As a general rule, the Government are shocked at the notion of making the judges their creatures, but they are extremely anxious to make them their creatures for one quarter of the current year. In the future as in the past, they wish the judges to be irremovable, and therefore independent; but in the present they wish to have the power of dismissing them. M. HUMBERT's solitary argument in favour of this proposal was an appeal to the supposed necessity of getting rid of magistrates who are hostile to the Republic. He did not attempt to show how this necessity has arisen, nor why it has become urgent now when it has not been urgent hitherto. Yet, when a Minister demonstrates the importance of keeping the judges irremovable by way of preface to a proposal to make them removable for the next three months, he may

fairly be expected to give some weighty reason for suspending the guarantee which he so much values. M. HUMBERT did not pretend that to suspend irremovability would not weaken it. He professed profound regret for the necessity the Government were under of taking this temporary power to themselves. But that was all. No evidence of the hostility of the existing judges to the Republic was brought forward. Nothing was said to show why the Republic, which has managed to get on very fairly with the existing judges, even under the reactionary administrations which preceded M. GRÉVY's election, should now find their decisions intolerable. The case for a suspension of irremovability is far less strong now than it was after the fall of NAPOLEON III., or after the resignation of Marshal MACMAHON. Then it might have been argued that all the judges had been appointed either under the Empire or under the Septennate. Now every year that has passed has done something to lessen the number of Imperialist or reactionary judges, and to put sound Republicans in their places. Then it was uncertain how far judges who by virtue of their original appointment might be ill disposed towards the Republic would be able to give effect to their dislike. Now the event shows that their powers in this way are exceedingly limited, and that the worst the Republic had to expect from their ill-will has not been enough to supply the MINISTER OF JUSTICE with a single example in support of his proposal.

A Cabinet which was willing to bid for the momentary favour of the Chamber of Deputies by suspending the irremovability of the judges deserves no pity when it turns out to have been mistaken in its calculation, and is condemned to see itself outbidden by the more extreme members of its own party. By 300 votes against 204 the Chamber decided that the judiciary should be removable, not for three months only, but for ever. The supporters of the Government, even when reinforced on this occasion by the Right, were largely outnumbered by the advanced Left. In the second division the Right deserted the Government, and a corresponding number of the Left seem to have returned to their side. The minority against the proposal to make the judiciary elective was 212; the majority in favour of it was 284. If the Right had voted with the Government, the division would probably have gone the other way. By going over to the Opposition the Right were able to inflict on the Cabinet the humiliation of a second defeat without making any sacrifice of their own convictions. Given that the judges are to be removable, the Right would rather that the power of appointing them should be taken out of the hands of the Government. They have more confidence in judges elected for a fixed term by Republican constituencies than in judges nominated by Republican Ministers and holding office during the pleasure of their masters.

THE SALVATION ARMY.

THE recent decision of the judges in the matter of the Salvation Army, while it was the reverse of unexpected, affords an instance of the inconvenience of a scheme of law without a code. At first sight, the facts upon which the judges had to decide in the case of BEATTY and others, appellants, GILLBANKS respondent, may look simple enough. These facts were, briefly, that a few months ago the proceedings of the "Salvation Army" at Weston-super-Mare were made a pretext for riotous proceedings on various occasions on the part of the mob generally, and especially of a band of persons calling themselves the "Skeleton Army." On the 23rd of March last, when the appellant BEATTY led the Salvation Army through the streets, a free fight took place, and, "in all probability, " bloodshed and injury were prevented by the interference "of the police." Such doings naturally annoyed the respectable inhabitants, who made complaints, of which the result was that two of the magistrates issued a notice, of which a copy was served upon BEATTY, in the following terms:—"Public Notice.—Whereas it hath been made to appear unto us, the undersigned, two of Her Majesty's "Justices of the Peace for the county of Somerset, acting "in and for the division, upon the oath of divers "persons, that a riotous assembly did take place "on the night of the 23rd March, in certain public "streets at Weston-super-Mare; and, further, that

"there are reasonable grounds for apprehending a repetition of such riotous and tumultuous assembly in the public streets of Weston-super-Mare; we do therefore hereby require, order, and direct all persons to abstain from assembling to the disturbance of the public peace in the public streets within the parish." In spite of this notice, on Sunday, 26th March, while numbers of the inhabitants were proceeding quietly to their respective places of worship, a Salvation Army procession was formed and paraded through the streets. A mob, as on former occasions, collected; and the sergeant of police told BEATTY, who was leading the procession, that he must desist in obedience to the notice. On his refusal he was arrested, and shouted to the procession to go on. It was then led by other persons, who also refused to desist, and who also were arrested. "Neither of the defendants were guilty of any overt act of violence other than these acts, " and they submitted quietly to their arrest." It was against the magistrates' subsequent order that BEATTY and the other persons arrested should find sureties to keep the peace that an appeal was made.

For the appellants it was contended that they were justified in insisting on making their way on in spite of opposition, not using force in the sense of blows or fighting, which would be contrary to their principles; and that they did not form an unlawful assembly, for an unlawful assembly meant an assembly either for an unlawful object, or with intent to carry out a lawful object riotously and tumultuously. Here there was no such intent; the appellants did nothing to break the peace. No doubt an assembly not for an unlawful object might become unlawful through riot or tumult on the part of the assembly itself; but "it was never yet heard that an assembly, in itself lawful, was made so by the unlawful conduct of others." The argument was that the riot was caused by the "Skeleton Army," and that it was against the persons composing it that steps should have been taken. To the question suggested by Mr. Justice FIELD, "How would it be if they (the Salvation Army) "knew that, on their attempting the procession, they would be resisted, and it would cause violence, and they persist in it?" the answer, Mr. CLARKE said, was that they ought to be protected from the violence of others. "For the magistrates merely to say that, because the Salvation Army are likely to be assailed by roughs and ruffians, therefore they are to be suppressed by force, is simply to proclaim mob rule and the abolition of law and order. The roughs and ruffians ought to be put down, not those who are lawful and peaceable." The case for the magistrates was argued ingeniously by Mr. POOLE; and in the course of the argument it was suggested that it would be impossible to keep a force of police on purpose to protect the Salvation Army, a suggestion which obviously enough has weight, but which hardly touches the actual law on the question, which was of course all that the Judges had to deal with. On the conclusion of the argument the Court decided, without hearing Mr. CLARKE in reply, that their judgment must be in favour of the appellants, and accordingly such judgment was given on the grounds set forth in the argument for the appellants. Mr. Justice FIELD asked whether it was criminal for persons holding strong religious convictions to hold assemblies with the object of inducing others to share their convictions, and to walk through the streets to their place of worship in order to attract others to go there. "It was suggested that, if such processions continued to be held, there would be similar opposition, and that this would lead to similar disturbances. He hoped not; for he hoped that when the opponents learnt—as they would now learn—that they had no right whatever to interfere with these processions of the Salvation Army, they would abstain from disturbing them. . . . If it were not so, he presumed that the magistrates and the police would understand their duty, and would not fail to do it, and that they would not hesitate to deal with the disturbers and the members of the "Skeleton Army" as they had dealt with the members of the Salvation Army. . . . He was sure that there was no intention on the part of the members of the Salvation Army of provoking opposition, and, being of opinion that they had not been guilty of the offence charged, he came to the conclusion that this order must be set aside."

It would be as impossible as it would be improper

find fault with the decision of the Court on the grounds stated, but at the same time there may be more than one cause for regret that the magistrates did not dispose of the case themselves by arresting members of the "Skeleton" instead of members of the "Salvation" band. There seems reason to believe that good has been done by the efforts of the "Salvation Army," but it is not easy to find cause for unmixed satisfaction at encouragement of the strongest kind having to be given to the hysterical eccentricities which are features common to the proceedings of the "Salvation Army" and of "revival" "meetings." It is not long since serious and seemingly very well founded complaints were made of the nuisance and disturbance caused by the doings of the Salvationists in a place of meeting which they opened in or near Oxford Street, and in which it was alleged that they made both day and night hideous with the ceaseless din of their "services." If protection is to be given—and no doubt it ought to be given—to the Salvationists, as peaceable and law-abiding people, against street ruffians, surely protection ought also to be given to other peaceable and law-abiding people against the doubtless well-meaning, but highly inconvenient, disturbances created by the Salvationists. This question, which is not part of the particular case just decided, but which arises naturally out of it, is one which may possibly give some trouble in the future. One of the inconveniences of life in a large English city is that it is possible for any person to annoy his neighbour in a variety of ways which may be serious enough, without any hindrance, except such as may be afforded by the issuing of an injunction. Cases of annoyance by cock-crowing and so forth crop up pretty frequently, and it is easy to believe that the annoyance caused by the Oxford Street Salvationists to their neighbours was far from being a light grievance. Yet, again, it is laid down that there is nothing against a procession through the streets for a lawful and peaceable purpose; and, if all the old ladies who go to draw their dividends chose to combine in a procession preceded by banners and accompanied by choruses of joyfulness, they would, it would seem, have a perfect right to do so. Yet it is a common experience enough that in matters of police jurisdiction and management the strict letter of the law cannot always be conveniently adhered to. Attacks upon peaceable persons by that pest of modern society, the "rough," are evidently against both the spirit and the letter of the law, and any determined suppression of the rough's attempted tyranny must be hailed with satisfaction. At the same time, it must be remembered that ordinary life in large communities must, if it is to be endurable, be conducted on the "give-and-take" principle, and it may be thought that the somewhat eccentric zeal of the Salvationists has prevented them from fully recognizing this fact. The Judges' decision in this case could not have been other than it was, and it will, we may hope, be efficacious in checking the scenes of ruffianism for which the proceedings of the "Salvation Army" have too long served as an excuse. But, on the other hand, it has been shown by the Oxford Street business that those very proceedings may in themselves amount to a nuisance, different, indeed, in kind and degree from that caused by the rough, but still an undeniable nuisance.

THE ECLIPSE.

IT was very recently said by some astronomers that "eclipses were played out," by which was meant that all observations of any value which could be made had been made, and that nothing further was to be learnt from them as regards the physics of the sun. The last total eclipse, which took place on the 17th of May, had the shortest duration of any which have been observed with instruments of precision; and it is found that, even in the brief interval of time in which it was possible to observe, so far from being played out, the observations open out a field which will require all the energies of astronomical physicists to traverse. The expedition to Egypt to observe this eclipse was originated and organized by the Committee on Solar Physics attached to the Science and Art Department, who, so far from accepting the general verdict, went rather out of their way to secure its despatch. The Treasury, we understand, declined the responsibility of supplying funds for what they called a purely speculative research; and, had it not been that the Council of the Royal Society, to whom the Committee finally appealed for aid, saw a chance of furthering the ends of science by making a grant from their private resources, England would have remained unrepresented, and all the honours would have fallen to France and Italy. Mr. Lockyer and Dr. Schuster headed the expedition, equipped with apparatus and material which promised to secure excellent

results. "Speculative research" might have been aided in this instance with advantage, and it is to be hoped that Treasury officials may not in the future be considered as the final judges as to what is speculative and what genuine research.

When we sum up the whole time in which scientific observations of eclipses have been made, we can scarcely grasp the fact that so much has been learnt regarding the sun in less than half an hour. In this brief period the constitution of the prominences round the sun has been determined, the atmosphere examined, and the corona finally adjudicated as being a solar appendage. Two minutes is an average time during which the disc of the sun is totally covered; but on the 17th May seventy seconds was the whole time available. What further remained, then, to be brought to light in these few seconds? Those who take the trouble to read certain technical and, perhaps, dry papers, which have appeared from time to time in the journals of the Royal Society, will have noticed a somewhat surprising discussion as to the possibility of the known elements being elements—for instance, iron has been considered by Mr. Lockyer not to be an element at all, but a compound body existing only as iron at the ordinary temperature to be found on our earth. From an examination of the spectrum of iron vapour at high temperatures such as those produced by the electric arc, and by the induction coil with a condenser, Mr. Lockyer deduced that iron vapour in this superheated condition was no longer iron, but split up into something else; and a comparison of the spectrum of this metal, at all possible terrestrial temperatures, with the solar spectrum led him to believe that perhaps a still greater simplification of this quasi-iron was to be found in the lower depths of solar chromosphere, where the temperature must be far greater even than that obtained from the induction coil. It will be manifest that if we examine the disc of the sun with the spectroscope, we get an integration of the spectrum of iron at all temperatures, since the light passes through all the layers of the different furnace heats existing at the solar surface. If, however, the disc is hidden as it is at an eclipse, and only a narrow rim of the metallic vapour layer at the sun's edge be exposed to view, the difficulty of discriminating between the different temperatures vanishes; the spectrum due to the hottest iron vapour will be nearest the eclipsed disc. Mr. Lockyer during the eclipse apparently observed the alteration in the iron spectrum at the different levels of this layer, and this adds new evidence as to the possibility of the truth of his hypothesis which we have already mentioned. On the other hand, it may equally well be said that iron may still be iron at the highest temperature, but that its spectrum is altered simply by the transcendental heat splitting up its coarse molecules into something finer, which still, however, remain iron molecules; in fact, we have analogies of this kind in certain elements which are gaseous at low temperatures.

Two French observers, with very powerful spectrosopes, found that a certain band of lines, called the B lines, which lies near the extremity of the red of the spectrum, was more intensely black in the portion of the solar disc which was adjacent to the encroaching limb of the moon. This dark band in the solar spectrum is ascribed to absorption taking place in our own atmosphere, since it is more intense at sunset or sunrise; but to what particular constituent of the atmosphere it is due is at present undecided. Arguing from this, the French observers have told us that the darkening they observed arises from an absorption in a lunar atmosphere, regarding the existence of which there has been much dispute. Whether the moon has an atmosphere or not, we do not pretend to say. The point should easily be settled by observation of the moon herself without the aid of eclipses, and we have but little doubt that this point will soon be cleared up. We may remark that Mr. Huggins, on very similar evidence, denies its existence.

At all recent eclipses photography has been called in to aid as an unerring recorder, and, on this occasion, it was by no means the least important method of attacking several momentous questions. It however occupies a more advantageous position than it did before; since photographic processes have been improved to such an extent that phenomena, which three years ago would have taken minutes to impress on the sensitive plate, now take but seconds. In comparison, then, with eclipses of which we have photographic records, excepting perhaps that of 1878 as observed in America, the late eclipse virtually lasted one hour, instead of a little over a minute. Then again, too, we have the application of a new photographic discovery made by Captain Abney, who has shown that not only the visible part of the spectrum can be photographed, but also that the dark rays which lie below the red, discovered by Sir W. Herschel, can be made photographically active. In a recent lecture at the Royal Institution it was shown that some of the lines to be found in this region of the solar spectrum were due to some form of hydrocarbon, and that this compound of hydrogen and carbon must be placed somewhere between us and the sun, but outside our own atmosphere. The spectrum of the region outlying the red prominences which encircle the eclipsed disc was photographed by means of this new preparation, in the hopes of tracing its locality. The result was negative, showing that the hydrocarbon was not close to the sun, but beyond the corona in space. Dr. Siemens, in a remarkable paper, has recently given us physical reasons for believing that all space may be filled with attenuated matter of some such description; and, if so, we should not expect to find it specially in a region close to the sun. This negative result is of interest; for, had it been present as a shell surrounding our luminary at a distance which would be compara-

tively cool, and where alone it would exist as a hydrocarbon, and not be decomposed into its elements of carbon and hydrogen, it must have been shown by the photographed spectrum.

Again, photography has settled a point which up to now has been a moot one—as to whether the corona was self-luminous, or whether it owed its brightness to reflected sunlight. An image of the eclipsed sun and the corona was thrown upon the slit of the photo-spectroscope in such a manner that the radiation from a central strip was spread out into a spectrum and photographed. The photograph shows a dark strip where the moon cut off the radiation of the sun's disc, though with two faint bright lines crossing it, and two bright bands parallel to the black band, shading off where the light of the corona became feeble. There are no breaks in continuity across these bright bands, but towards the violet end we have it streaked by bright lines, the two most intense of which coincide with the two lines just mentioned. If we wish to interpret the photograph we must refer not only to the sun, but also to the laboratory. If sunlight reflected from any body be analysed by the spectroscope, it is found that the same breaks in the continuity of the spectrum occur as are seen in the spectrum of the direct light from the sun. The absence of these breaks thus proves that the corona takes no appreciable part of its tranquil luminosity from reflected sunlight at all events near the sun; and the continuous spectrum shows that it is self-luminous. Again, in our laboratories, if we cause a gas to be heated to an exceedingly high temperature, as by the spark from an induction coil, we find that the light from it is in reality made up of lines of different colours lying in different parts of the spectrum. Applying this to the photograph in question, we find that the spectrum must be one of a gas at a high temperature as well as in a tolerably condensed state. From other photographs taken of the corona itself, we know that this gas extends at least one and a half solar diameters away from the sun; hence even at this distance there must be such a transcendental temperature that no compound such as a hydrocarbon could well exist within that limit. To what these lines may be due has yet to be determined by laboratory experiment, though, from some seven or eight lines being in the position of hydrogen lines, we may make a fair guess as to their chief origin. The two strongest lines, lines which are also seen across the black moon's spectrum, have been usually allotted to calcium; but we find that there is a hydrogen line in the same part of the spectrum as one of them, whilst there is no settled analogue to the other. We cannot think that the coronal atmosphere is calcium, but must look for some other source for it. That our atmosphere is illuminated during an eclipse by coronal light is evident from the fact that two of the brightest lines found in the corona appear in so extraordinary a place.

Another point which has been finally cleared up is the exact position of a certain bright line in coronal regions, to which no analogue could be found in terrestrial elements. Called "1474 stuff," from the position it occupies in a scale of the spectrum mapped by Kirchoff, it is a crux to solar physicists. Mr. Lockyer has finally settled its right position, and it still remains the same mysterious object as before.

We may thus briefly sum up the results of the eclipse. Different temperature levels have been discovered in the solar chromosphere; the constitution of the corona has now the possibility of being determined, and it is proved to shine with its own light. A suspicion has been aroused once more as to the existence of a lunar atmosphere, and the position of an important line has been confirmed. Hydrocarbons do not exist close to the sun, but may be in space between us and it.

The interest of this eclipse was also doubled by the fact that the same general features were observable during its short duration as were observable in 1871 and 1875; now, as then, the sun-spot cycle being near its maximum. In 1865 and 1878, when it was at its minimum, the observed phenomena were of a different character, indicating in all probability a lower solar surface temperature.

CAIRO.

THREE are few places on which the hand of modern improvement has fallen more heavily than on Cairo. A very short time ago it was an Arab city, within walls, having gates like a mediaeval fortress, and narrow unpaved streets often ending in blind alleys. The Europeans dwelt apart in the westernmost quarter round an open space of irregular form called the Rosetti Garden. The Coptic quarter was to the north-west, the Persian to the north-east. There was a long suburb southward towards the mounds of Fostat, the so-called "Old Cairo," and the "port" of Boolak by the river's side was about a mile and a half west of the city. Between them stretched a wide lake, the Esbekieh, which half the year was a mere swamp; and beside it were a few palaces, among them that which the French general Kleber was actually building when he was assassinated, and which afterwards became an hotel. Round the hotel were a number of large sycamores, under whose shade the gaudy tents of the Syrian dragomans were spread in the sight of the tourist. In those days, say fifteen years ago at most, the Moosky, the principal street of the European quarter, called after the Kantaret el Moosky, a bridge over the canal built by a Vizier of that name in the time of Saladin, was covered overhead by boarding to keep out the sun, and was entered from the

Esbekieh through a great vaulted gateway. Now the Moosky has paved sidewalks, is macadamized, has no boarding overhead, and no gateway at the end. Then, when the carriage of some great Pasha came by, you turned your back for fear ladies might be in it, as you would be in danger of life or liberty if you were detected looking at them; now ladies of the upper ranks drive about very much as they do here, and various princesses are well known by sight; indeed, not very long ago two Turkish ladies appeared riding on horseback in the Shoobra Road. To see Cairo as an Oriental city it is now needful to plunge into very unsavoury back slums; year by year the more picturesque features are gradually disappearing, and since the mania for "restoration" entered the Turkish mind the few old buildings that remained are in danger of being rebuilt, like the Goreeyeh Mosque, by some Greek architect, as ignorant of ancient art as he is destitute of natural genius. The great folk, whether Turks, natives, or ordinary Europeans, live in the spacious quarter known as Ismailia, between the old city and Boolak; while Boolak itself, although it is outside the *octroi* boundaries, is united to Cairo by a long straggling street, which begins with hotels and churches and ends in wooden sheds. The whole of this great new quarter—with which the late Khedive fondly hoped to rival Paris—is built in a way which nowhere else would be called building. Although there are some good houses, in others the walls are literally heaped up with stones of all shapes and sizes, daubed with untempered mortar or Nile mud alone. In the contents of a given piece of walling the proportion of stone is often slightly below that of mortar. Yet good stone is everywhere abundant, and lime needs only burning. The foundations are either on the peaty land to which the annual inundation reaches, or on the rock which here and there crops up within the new quarter; but for the most part the houses are very unsafe, and would not stand three days in any other climate. One trembles to think what Cairo would be like after a good week of our December weather—say two days of snow, a day of frost, and three of thaw with rain. It would melt away, the new quarter going first.

Cairo grew out of a palace. It is usual to read that it was built when Fostat, or Old Cairo, was burnt; but it existed long before the destruction of its neighbour, which, indeed, was never called Cairo, new or old, while it existed, but Misr, or vulgarly Fostat, "the tent," because there the first Arab conqueror encamped. Its ruinous mounds are still often described as "Misr al Attikal," the Old Misr. But modern Cairo was at first a fort built by Jauhar, the commander of the army of the schismatic Fatimite Khalif, who, having wrested Egypt from the old Baghda family, prepared here a residence for Al Mu'izz, whom he brought from his western capital, Cairoon, and installed at Cairo. There is, oddly enough, no real connexion between these names. Cairoon, of which we have heard so much lately, is properly Kairawan, a name of unknown meaning, which some have plausibly derived from Cyrene. But the Egyptian city, or fort, or palace, was at first called after a suburb of Cairoon, Al Mansurieh, where the Khalifs had resided; and it was not till Al Mu'izz came himself to take possession, bringing with him the bodies of his ancestors, that the place, or part of it, obtained the name of Al Kahira, the subjugator or oppressor, the feminine form of Al Kahir, which is the Arab designation of the planet Mars, under whose evil influence the foundations were said to have been laid. The name Al Kahira, observes Mr. Henry Kay, in a learned paper on the subject read before the Royal Asiatic Society some months ago, "owing to its conveying a sense of subjection to violence and arbitrary power, has always been unpopular, and is still regarded by the people of Egypt with half superstitious dislike." There is a fate involved in bearing such a name; and Cairo has not escaped its doom. Subjection to one successful soldier after another has been its history from the days of Jauhar to those of Araby.

The old palace stood where now is the court of the Kadee. Thence it spread on either side till, two centuries after its foundation, on the death of the last Khalif of the Fatimite line, it was found to be inhabited by twelve thousand persons, all, except the family of the Khalif, either eunuchs or women. On the south it reached to a mosque where the Commander of the Faithful, with a curtain held before him that none might see his sacred face, read prayers on Fridays, as chief Imam of Islam. The mosque was called in consequence Al Azhar, the most splendid, as the adjoining palaces were Ez Zahirah, the splendid. The glory has departed, the courts have been repeatedly rebuilt, the minarets are in the tawdriest taste; but Al Azhar is still the centre of Al Kahira, the college where the Koran is taught, and where all that there is of fanaticism in Egypt is nurtured and cultivated. On the west the gardens and grounds of the palace extended to the canal, which then, as now, led from the Nile right through the city. The bridge which we mentioned above is lined with houses, so that many people who now drive along the Moosky to the bazaar, have as little idea that they are crossing a bridge as that the Khan Khalil is the burial-place of the Fatimite Khalifs. Here, in the great walled garden, was the resting-place of the bodies brought by Al Mu'izz from Cairoon in 972, and here he and his descendants were buried. When the Fatimites came to an end, and orthodoxy was re-established, these old graves were no more venerated than the burial-place of Alfred in Hyde Abbey at the suppression of the monasteries. The ground which they occupied, in the heart of what had by this time become a great city, was very valuable. We need not wonder,

therefore, that when in 1292 Goharkis al Khalili obtained a grant of the land no one interfered to prevent him from digging up the bodies of Al Muizz and his relatives, and throwing them out on the mounds of rubbish to the east of the city. But the people attributed it to the just judgment of Allah upon him that, being killed in a Syrian battle, his body was exposed to the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and never received burial at the hands of his companions. His bazaar has been much improved in the modern sense, and has, like the Moosky, lost half its beauty in the process. The archway is still intact which used to form the entrance of the slave market; over it still hang the models of ships which pious slave merchants used to vow for a successful voyage; but, within, the old cabins have been removed, as well as the honeycomb of wooden galleries and closets in which in the good days before Frank interference the predecessors of Arabi came to seek for fair Circassians and graceful Abyssinians. The street outside, which now leads to the beautiful mosques of Kalaon and his son where travellers go to see the Gothic archway of English or French work brought from Acre by some victorious Sultan, perhaps Saladio, is commonly called the Coppersmiths' Bazaar (Sook en Nahaseen); but it is properly the Bayn el Kasrayn, or "Between the Palaces"; and a passage is said to have gone under the road so that the Khalif might go from one side to the other without being seen. It was not until after the extinction of the Fatimite Khalifate, and the removal of the seat of the government to the newly-built citadel, that "Al Kahirah was gradually absorbed and lost in the city that Mad began to grow up under its walls."

The military despotism which now once more threatens Cairo is only a repetition of the history of the middle ages down to the Turkish conquest in 1516. Successive armies mutinied under successive generals, who in their turn built themselves mausoleums in which they were but seldom interred after their inevitable assassination. It has been pointed out that until now a force of Turks has always been in the pay of the Pasha of Egypt, who has, therefore, since the time of Mohammed Aly been able to maintain a position which the present Viceroy cannot hold, having no soldiers but of one kind. He thus resembles the rulers of Egypt before the Turkish conquest, when king after king was murdered by his Memlooks, or killed in battle by a rival. There is hardly a street corner in the old city without its tradition of blood. There is hardly a minaret which does not mark the scene of some tragedy. Al Makrizi, as quoted by Mr. Kay, offers an unpleasant picture of life in Cairo in the thirteenth century. The citizens were to be pitied for having to use water from contaminated wells, and from a canal full of the drainage of the neighbouring houses; for having to breathe the hot air of the desert, and incur ophthalmia. Another writer, Ibn Said, complains that life in Cairo is hard and poor, especially for the learned. The professors at the college have miserable salaries. The Jews and the Christians, as he bitterly observes, have a better lot than that of the faithful. They are occupied in medicine and in the collection of taxes. But Cairo is a good place for a pauper. Here he may live without fear of taxes or tithes, of summonses or torments. He has no slave whose death may be pretext for charging his master with having succeeded to an inheritance. He is not, therefore, likely to be imprisoned, fined, and tortured. Bread is cheap and abundant; he lives a life of ease; he is free to enjoy the songs and public amusements, and may even intoxicate himself with hemp, dance naked, and behave foolishly. He does not fear impressment for the galley. That is a fate reserved for the Western immigrant. When the Moor from Spain, with his knowledge of a seafaring life, comes to Cairo, says Ibn Said, who was a Spanish Moor, he finds himself between two alternatives. If he is rich, he is squeezed and plundered, and obtains no relief except by flight. If he is poor, he is cast into prison until there is an opportunity for sending him to serve at an oar in the fleet. We have changed all this, or thought we had done so; but the example now before us shows how soon it would all come back. It is not very creditable to France and England that under a Government of their institution, and with their support and guarantee, the times of Kalaon, who gave Cairo over to pillage for three days, seem to have come back; and that even the intervention of the "unspeakable Turk" is desired by all who do not profit by anarchy and disorder. The modern representative of Ibn Said's pauper may rejoice at the present state of things, but nobody else; and a satire which was bitter in the thirteenth century is doubly bitter in the nineteenth.

SIR ASHLEY EDEN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL.

THE absorption of every other interest into the vortex of Irish politics may be one main reason why comparatively so little notice has been taken of the government of Bengal by Mr. (now Sir) Ashley Eden during the past five years. Beyond half a column of the *Times*, a few words of praise from its Calcutta Correspondent, and some passing remarks in other journals to the effect that the late Lieutenant-Governor seems to "have done very well," no one has attempted to show of what Bengal stood in need, or what it has got, and how it is that all classes, Englishmen and natives, have united in congratulations and addresses and testimonials to the successful administrator who has contrived to reconcile jarring interests, to satisfy the Zamindars without abandoning the cause of the Ryots, to please a Chamber of

Commerce composed of British merchants, and to meet the requirements of native agriculture, communication, and trade without imposing any other than light burdens on a community already fairly taxed. No Civil servant, however strong in experience, in the confidence of the Viceroy, and in the loyal support of the Civil and the Uncovenanted services, is likely to set about the task of ruling, single-handed, any one of the three great divisions of the Bengal Presidency with a light heart. But, heavy as is the pressure of the North-West Provinces with the recent addition of Oudh, and perplexing as are the feuds and grievances of border tribes ever ready to sweep down on the plains of the Indus, it is no disparagement to say that the weight of administration falls much heavier on the occupant of Belvedere than on either of the Lieutenant-Governors who divide their time between Lahore and Simla, or between Allahabad and Naini Tal. The reason for this is pretty clear. The Provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa contain a population not far short of seventy millions. The revenues are double those of Madras and Bombay, and some four or five times larger than that of the Punjab. Bengal has accumulated a pressing arrear of wants and claims in a century of our rule, and though the heaviest items of its Budget, such as opium and the land revenue, are collected by easy processes without harassment or vexatious inquiries, there are all sorts of interests which it is not very easy to reconcile, and various bodies and associations to be guided, satisfied, or controlled. Then the memories of native misgovernment by the sword and the screw, which so often elsewhere facilitate the establishment of the new rule of the foreigner, have long ceased to actuate any appreciable portion of the population of the Lower Provinces. The test of comparison between the ferocious Nawab, or Naib, or Kardar of yesterday, and the just and vigorous English Commissioner and magistrate of to-day, entirely fails in Bengal. The energies of high-handed and independent Englishmen and Scotchmen have stirred up native stagnation in the remotest corners of Eastern and Western Bengal. The native Zamindar has long known how to employ his ample manorial privileges to his own advancement. The Ikyot, taught by the schoolmaster or by the force of example, has learnt in his turn how to combine for his own peace and security. Educated natives of every degree and caste demand a large share of the public offices at the disposal of the Government, and every year they are becoming more efficient in all branches of Civil administration. All these causes tend to interest such classes in the permanence of English rule; but they by no means lighten the task and the anxieties of the ruler.

For some generations Bengal had a Governor of its own; but as this personage, from the days of Warren Hastings down to Lord Dalhousie, was no less than the Governor-General, it may easily be imagined that what with conquests and annexations, campaigns in Nepal, in Central India, and on the Sutlej and the Chenab, Bengal Proper was governed by fits and starts, or rather by fits without the starts, and it engaged just as much of an English statesman's attention as he could spare from the subjugation of Mahrattas, Pindaris, and Sikhs. Other provinces had long ago secured a Lieutenant-Governor or Chief Commissioner of their own, and were making progress in roads, Settlements, and other Anglo-Indian stock subjects, while Bengal was left to the management of secretaries who were very able, and Boards that were brimful of experience about land revenues and the monopolies of opium and salt. But the steam power was wanting; and, while Bengal contributed largely to the Imperial exchequer, it was put off with very little money or statesmanship in return. It is strictly true that, forty years ago, with the exception of the streets of Calcutta, the grand trunk road to Benares, and that to the Governor-General's country house at Barrackpore, there was not one single metalled road that connected Calcutta with any important district anywhere, nor could a wheel carriage be drawn by horses or bullocks at all times and seasons over any part of Bengal Proper or the province of Orissa. Bengal then suffered under an absurd civil code, a bastard criminal law grafted on the Mahomedan, a corrupt native judiciary, and an ill-paid, venal, and incompetent police. At the last renewal of the East Indian Company's charter in 1853 the requirements of Bengal were urged on Sir Charles Wood by Lord Dalhousie, and were at last recognized by Parliament and the press. From the year 1854 seven Lieutenant-Governors, all men of ability and some of real eminence, have administered its government without being hampered by an Executive Council. Sir F. Halliday enjoyed three years of peace and prosperity, followed by two years of violent convulsion and disturbance. After the Mutiny his successor, Sir J. P. Grant, had to deal with a war of classes and interests, and, to borrow Lord Macaulay's fine expression about Metcalfe in Jamaica, was occupied in "calming the evil passions which long suffering had engendered in one class and long domination in another." On the late Sir Cecil Beaton fell the Orissa famine, for which he failed to make due provision; and Sir William Grey, who came next, had to govern as best he could, with an exhausted treasury, and a community which was crying out for all sorts of boons. Sir George Campbell and Sir Richard Temple had had very little previous acquaintance with the details of internal administration in the Gangetic Delta, though the first possessed remarkable creative and constructive faculties, while the latter was a marvel of rapid conception and execution, whether in the saddle or in the palanquin, from the deck of a steamer, the howdah of an elephant, or under a *punkah* at the desk. Nor must we forget that the Behar famine intervened between the last year of Sir George and the first of Sir Richard. No doubt, in spite of mutinies, famines,

depletions in the treasury, and other obstacles, not a little was done to promote the interests of all classes by these administrators; and the school of Thomason in the North-West Provinces and that of the Lawrence in the Punjab has long ceased to talk of Bengal in the pitying tone which Sergeant Snubbins adopted in speaking of Mr. Phunky. It was a graceful act on the part of Mr. Eden that, at an entertainment given by the Trades Association, he pointedly dwelt on the serious difficulties with which his able predecessors had successively to contend. He did not add that his own merit lay in seizing on the skirts of happy chances and developing to the full the germs left by previous administrators.

Mr. Eden had an hereditary interest in India, though he entered the service just ten years after his unfortunate uncle had left it under the clouds and disasters of the first Afghan war. It has been remarked that no other Anglo-Indian of eminence, with the exception of Sir George Clerk, ever gave so little indication in his college days of what was really in him. At Haileybury Mr. Eden won neither prizes nor medals, and he left college nearly at the bottom of his list. We note this especially because almost all other Civil servants who have risen to distinction in India, took honours either in classical or Oriental literature or in both, or in law, history, and mathematics; while the dunces of the college have not unusually ripened into the full-blown bad bargains of the State. But Mr. Eden, when once he had fairly settled down as a young officer to district work, gained an insight into the land tenures of Bengal, the native character and language, administrative difficulties and departmental details, such as only one of his predecessors in the Lieutenant-Governorship ever attained. He became familiar with Bengal and with Orissa, and with the Santal Pergunnahs. He worked hard as Secretary to the Board of Revenue, and for nearly ten years was Secretary to the Government of Bengal. Like many other clever officials who had some reforms or theories to ventilate, he was at one time a frequent contributor to the press. When the Ryots of several districts in 1860 revolted against the hereditary cultivation of indigo, because it had never paid them, Mr. Eden was the first to point out that every tenant-proprietor in Bengal was, in theory at least, the virtual owner of the soil, and ought to be allowed to sow it with rice, or under contract to cultivate indigo or any other crop; and that this supposed freedom of contract had been overridden for two or three generations by the influence and power of the planters, backed by the wealth of mercantile houses, and, with few exceptions, by the advocacy of the English press. It remained for the Indigo Commission, for Sir J. P. Grant the Lieutenant-Governor, and for Sir Charles Wood, then at the India Office, to refuse assent to all projects for compelling Ryots to sow indigo under any law making a breach of contract a criminal offence, and to relegate a temporary enactment passed with this object to the limbo of exploded theories and defeated creeds. It was also a useful episode in Mr. Eden's life that he was placed on the Army Commission, and that he was deputed to act as Chief Commissioner of British Burma. He further, as member of the Council of the Viceroy, learnt to balance local against national and Imperial questions; and when the time came for him to be set over a great province, he was in no danger of giving a fictitious importance to any alleged wants of Bengal and Behar; though it would not be easy to select any part of our Indian dependency where a really valuable measure affects so large a portion of the community, or has a much fairer chance of eventual repayment in the loyalty and contentment of the mass of the people.

Hence it happened that when Mr. Eden assumed the reins of the Bengal Government he had no apprenticeship to serve. He knew what were the duties of the Commissioner of the division just as well as he did those of the magistrate's clerk. He had no store of pet projects, and no hankering after some one particular grand reform such as Shore and Cornwallis had effected eighty years before in Bengal, or Munro had rooted and established in Madras. To use his own expression, he had no policy; or rather he knew that his best chance of success lay in seeing that each class received its fair share of attention, and each division or district its due assignment of public money for schools, police-stations, civil and criminal justice, railways and roads. The first element of success in these matters consists, in India as elsewhere, in getting sufficient money and in spending it discreetly and well. Lord Mayo began the scheme of interesting each of the eight local Governments in the effective management of finance by handing over to them certain branches of the public revenue, which they were allowed to spend without perpetual reference to an inquisitive financial department. This plan was still further developed in 1877, and Mr. Eden, though not perhaps supported as he ought to have been, has yet contrived to augment the provincial revenue and to keep down the provincial expenditure. New railroads have been constructed in some of the most backward districts, or have connected Calcutta with parts of Bengal which were practically as distant from the metropolis as the lower portions of the Punjab, Rungpore and Dinagepore, to which few civilians would ever go unless they were proof against damp and rheumatism or were ardent sportmen, have, or will soon have, complete railways of their own. There are other lines working in Gaya and Tirhoot; and others, again, are under survey and construction. Alluvial Bengal requires no tunnels, and though bridges must be numerous and embankments must be made proof against heavy rainfalls and destructive floods, there is perhaps no part of India where these works are sure to carry so large an amount of passengers and goods. At this moment the Eastern Bengal line, carried out during the administration of Lord Canning, stands at the head of the list of

Anglo-Indian remunerative Companies. Yet it only connects Calcutta with the old capital of Eastern Bengal, and with the Ganges and half a dozen of its affluents.

The prospects and position of the native public servants have been improved, and an increase of pay for native magistrates and civil judges has had a perceptible effect in raising the tone and independence of the judicial and executive services. More money has been spent on grants in aid to inspected schools, while the Government retains the direct management of colleges and a few high-class schools affiliated to the University of Calcutta. Whatever may be the result of Lord Ripon's famous Committee on Education, the course taken by the Bengal Government of retiring from the direct control of the lower schools, and inviting the natives themselves to supply the demand for lower middle-class education, aided by grants from the State, seems likely to be approved. Natives of Bengal have hitherto shown little aptitude for the profession of civil engineering; but a college for practical instruction in this art has been established in the neighbourhood of Calcutta. Sanskrit studies, female education, even Persian and Arabic, have been recognized and encouraged, and the Buddhist shrines of Gaya have been repaired without causing any outcry about a Christian Government spending money on the structures of heathens. Like other administrators, Mr. Eden has had a good deal to say to prison reform, and has enforced cleanliness, economy, and order. Gaols have always been a difficulty in India, where men cannot mess together without loss of caste, or be put to solitary and close confinement without danger to health or reason, or crowded together in big dormitories without fear of contagion or of revolt. In many other local departments the intimate knowledge and the ready resources of the late Lieutenant-Governor have been brought to bear with signal effect. But the last of his administrative measures will be thought in England the greatest step in advance. It is the beginning of local self-government. We have been amused at seeing this tentative and judicious measure transformed by one or two of our advanced contemporaries into an announcement that "representative institutions" have been given to Bengal. Nothing is further from Sir A. Eden's intention than the institution of a local Parliament or Home Rule for Bengal. But some writers think that civilization is impossible unless noisy harangues and silent ballot-boxes are made the inalienable birth-right of a population just beginning to find out that it has any rights and duties at all. What Sir A. Eden wishes is, to "promote among the people a genuine and intelligent concern in the management of local affairs and the development of local institutions." In this view he is prepared to establish Boards in districts or counties and sub-divisional Boards in portions of such districts. As a general rule he would nominate to the office, but in a few places he would try election, and exact as a qualification for a voter the payment of 25 rupees to the Road-cess or of 20 rupees to the Licence-tax, or an income, from sources other than land, of 1,000 rupees a year. To Committees so elected or nominated he would make over the control of primary and secondary schools, of dispensaries, of provincial roads, of staging bungalows, and other local concerns. And, alas for the freedom and independence of the newly-enfranchised Bengali, he insists on it that the magistrate of the district should be the Chairman of the district Board. We apprehend that, in like manner, the joint magistrate at the subdivision will be Chairman of the local or sub-divisional Board. No one knows better than Sir A. Eden that the proclivities of existing native committees often tend to jobbery, delays, and limitless loquacity without action; and that hitherto it has been found difficult to overcome "apathy and indifference" and to get Bengalis to undertake any public duty for which they are not paid. If anything can make the experiment a failure, it will be the determination of zealous partisans either in England or India to credit the native with all the virtues and powers of a Liberal caucus. If anything can ensure its success it is the wise and temperate tone with which Sir A. Eden contends for the management and responsibility of the district officers as heads and directors of these nascent municipalities.

Much of the late Lieutenant-Governor's time must have been taken up not with new measures but with actual administration on the old lines, or with the consideration and outline of reforms which his successor may carry out. It is in the science of governing aliens, in the management of public bodies, in the selection and promotion of the members of the various services, in the firm correction of abuses, that a vigorous and capable ruler in India is most sure to be felt. The public at a distance looks only to a legislative or a financial result. But we are quite sure that the few Anglo-Indian dissentients from the general tribute of praise are the malingerers and the incompetent. It is wholly impossible that bodies so divergent in aims as the British India Association, the *Englishman* and the *Hindu Patriot* newspapers, the Trades Association, the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, the Maharajas of Behar and the Baboos of Calcutta, should present addresses to a departing ruler unless he had impressed them by an exhibition of vigour, fearlessness, and justice. For be it noted that Sir A. Eden has appointed a Rent Commission to inquire into the condition of the cultivators and the encroachments of the Zemindars, and has once again interceded, with mediation and restraint, between the manufacturers of indigo in Behar and the contractors for the growth and delivery of the raw material. It must be a subject of congratulation to all of these associations that the Indian Council at Westminster will be strengthened by the recent experience and sterling abilities

of the late Lieutenant-Governor. And if future rulers find their task easier, if the press and the non-official public are not henceforth to be in constant opposition to the Government, if Bengal has really entered on a career of prosperity and improvement, if her vast population is to escape the visitations of fevers and famines, if the land, secured to its virtual owners, is to find a more ready outlet for produce, and if the superior landholders are to seek some more elevating employment than ceaseless litigation, it will in no slight measure be due to the wise and prudent administration of one who has displayed some of the best characteristics of a paternal and forcible administrator, while he has been slowly and surely educating the people to do something for themselves.

A CHAMPAGNE RING.

DURING the last week certain persons have been writing to the *Times* on the subject of a "champagne ring," and the *Times* has itself commented on their complaints with its usual benevolent vagueness. An examination of the documents does not discover much unanimity in them. The principal is that of a person who is apparently a retail wine-merchant, and whose complaint seems to be not so much that the public pay too much for champagne (though he asserts this) as that the retailers do not on favourite and popular brands get enough profit. A guileless American writes to say that he asked the waiter at an English hotel to recommend him some champagne, and that it was very bad, and that the waiter, being upbraided, confessed that he had a commission on the corks. Another person complains that not merely will people insist on buying certain brands, but they insist on their friends giving them no other. This last complaint is very agreeable. It is not usual at dinner-parties to ask for the cork, and by the simple process of enveloping the bottle (as is frequently done) in a napkin, the label, if there is one, becomes invisible, so that it is not clear how the guests are to discover what brand they are drinking. If the wine is decanted, a heathenish practice, they cannot tell it at all, save by taste. If they have knowledge enough of wine to find it out by the taste, their unhappy host may be quite certain that they will have knowledge enough to know good wine from bad, and will be quite satisfied with any brand of the former that he chooses to give them. But, if he has any friends who merely judge by corks and labels, and are indignant at not being served with the most fashionable and most expensive wine, independently of the question of its goodness, we can tell him of an infallible remedy, as to the adoption of which we should ourselves not hesitate for a moment. He had much better not let such people darken the doors of his dining-room. Neither have we much pity for the American victim. The whole merit of the brand system is that it puts a man beyond the power of waiters or landlords to defraud without downright forgery—a very dangerous proceeding. It is surely not very difficult for an adult human being to make up his mind whether he likes Pommery or Perrier-Jouët, Deutz and Geldermann or Irroy, and, when he does not know the cellar, to stick to what he does like. These woes, therefore, are not worthy of much attention.

There remains the more serious charge of a "champagne ring," made by a person apparently writing with at least an expert's authority. On examination, however, it does not appear that this complainant uses words very accurately. All that his complaint comes to is that certain houses, by lavish advertising or other means, create a great reputation, and then charge retailers exorbitant prices, which they are obliged to give because their customers blindly demand these brands. Now it will strike everybody that this is not what is meant by a ring. A ring is a combination to keep up or force up prices by securing the whole supply of a certain article, not the obtaining of an excessive reputation for certain varieties of that article by the ordinary processes of creating demand. Besides, the facts are against the *Times*' correspondent. We have before us two price lists of two of the best wine-merchants in England, issued quite recently. The highest priced champagne in both of these lists (except some Clicquot *Russe* of unusual age) is of a brand which is rarely or never advertised, which is scarcely named in the books on champagne, and which we never remember to have seen on a single wine-list at an hotel or a restaurant. The wine fully deserves its position, and is quite worth the money; but it is evident that it has not reached that position by any of the means which the injured retailer in the *Times* complains of. It has reached it simply because the few wine-merchants who do keep it know what it is worth, and recommend it to their customers. Again, here is a fact of a different kind. About four years ago shippings of a certain wine began to come to England from one of the best known of champagne firms, but one which is not at the present moment in what the *Times*' correspondent would call the ring. The wine was of a kind which the firm had not long made, and it could be bought all over London at seventy shillings a dozen, while similar wine of the same vintage by the crack shippers was selling at ten shillings more. The other day we saw in a Co-operative Society's list that a parcel of this wine had just been secured, and was selling at ninety shillings ready money, or the same price as the very "crackest" brands of the same vintage. Now it was open to any retailer who knew his business to buy, four or five years ago, a hundred or a thousand cases of that wine with the certainty of making a large profit on it. That could not be done if there were in any sense a champagne ring.

Moreover, all wine-merchants' customers and all wine-merchants are not the fools that this gentleman represents them as being. A year or two ago a certain person was talking to his wine-merchant about a price current that had just been issued. "I see," he said, "that you have not got any of _____'s shipping this year." "No," said the wine-merchant, "they want so many shillings a dozen more than anybody else. We don't think the wine is worth it, and we find that our customers are quite willing to follow our judgment on that point; so we have put in _____'s and _____'s instead." Of course, if retail wine-merchants have not the judgment, the capital, or the power of insuring confidence in their customers to enable them to do this, they simply play into the hands of the shippers, and it may be very much suspected that the real fault is this very want of judgment and capital. Without these a retailer cannot go into the market and plunge at the proper moment. He has to get his supplies by dribs and drabs from the shipper or his agents as he wants them, and of course he is at the shipper's mercy. The sooner people understand (as their fathers understood) that wine-selling is not a mere over-the-counter business, and that from mere over-the-counter dealers they can never hope to get good wine, so much the better for the health of themselves and their guests. But all this does not prove the existence of a ring, or of anything like a ring. Some years ago there was rather a questionable discovery in the champagne trade. It was alleged in the newspapers, and not denied, that pressure on the part of the retailers had been put on a shipper to induce him to boycott a London wine-merchant who was selling the wine cheaper than other people. This was much more like a ring; but it was a retailers' ring, and not a shippers' one.

However, there is no doubt that champagne is very dear; the only point requiring consideration is whether it is unfairly dear. Price (except in Irish land) is understood to be determined by cost of production, by competition in the open market, by supply and demand, by relative merit. Now everything from this point of view is in favour of the champagne-makers. No one who has given the slightest attention to the subject is unaware that the production of champagne, from the first day that the vine culture begins to the last when the case goes on shipboard, is extraordinarily costly. In no other kind of wine-growing is half the care and labour spent on the vines; the expense of making is a mere trifle in the very costliest claret or burgundy compared with that in the case of champagne; the loss by breakage (a practically nonexistent item in other wines) is enormous. But there is much more than this. Champagne is, to speak roundly, never the produce of a single vineyard. The quantities of different grapes and different districts for a single *cuvée* are the results literally of centuries of experiments, and the proportions are the secrets of the producer. Again, though the Phylloxera has spared Champagne, the vintages have, with few exceptions, been bad for years past, and at the same time the distress of other districts through the Phylloxera itself has of course been the fair commercial advantage of the province. Lastly, it must be remembered that the demand, though it has not, as popular fiction has it, yet beaten the supply, is constantly increasing. In hardly any of the smaller social matters is the difference between the England of the present day and the England of thirty years ago more marked than in the case of the drinking of champagne. Now the finest wine of the province, the wine which flavours and constitutes the great *cuvées*, is almost a constant quantity and does not admit of multiplication. The inference, as far as the price of these *cuvées* go, is unavoidable.

Last of all, there is no doubt whatever that the relative price of champagne to that of other sparkling wines does not unfairly represent its comparative merits. To begin with, all other sparkling wines are comparative novelties, and there is nothing that so depends on old practice and traditional skill as the making of good wine. Sparkling wines are now to be obtained at every conceivable price, from a guinea a dozen or thereabouts upwards. There is the enormous production of the Loire district, which seems to be greedily consumed by those who like it, and against which there is nothing to be said as far as wholesomeness goes. But in respect of flavour, no one who knows what wine is would dream of comparing even the best Saumur or Vouvray with a moderate champagne. There is sparkling burgundy; and it may be observed that sparkling burgundy (white, not red; for red sparkling wines, except as an occasional curiosity, are rather a mistake) is the nearest approach to champagne. But nearly all sparkling burgundy, and still more that excellent southern growth, St. Péray, has the defect of being too strong. Wine that sparkles is intended to be drunk, not sipped; and considerable caution is required in drinking sparkling burgundy, which, however, let it be repeated, is the best substitute, at about three-fourths of the price, for champagne. Sparkling Rhine and Moselle wines everybody knows. At their very best they are good, but they are not cheap; you may get, if you take a little care, a far better champagne for less money. Besides, the peculiar flowery flavour which is the charm of hock and moselle almost invariably becomes pompadish in character in the process of manufacture into *vin mousseux*. The remarkable freshness and cleanliness of taste which are the chief charms of champagne are absent. As for miscellaneous sparkling wines, such as those of Italy, Hungary, the Jura, &c., they need not be seriously mentioned. Except the inexperienced burglar, who, having made away with a dozen or so of champagne, said "It was like ginger-beer, but not so good," no one would think of

denying that the arithmetical relation of the price of these wines to that of champagne is reasonable enough.

All these things being taken together, it appears that the great champagne shippers have no monopoly, but that they have the greatest demand, and the best article to supply. This combination means high prices all the world over. As it is, the very best champagne is dear certainly. But nobody is forced to drink it, and anybody can, if he chooses, buy very excellent champagne at a comparatively moderate price. But he must have judgment and capital of his own, or go to a wine-merchant who has capital and judgment. That, we take it, is very much the condition of things in reference to most commercial transactions in this world; so that it would not appear that champagne buying is in any exceptional position.

DOCTORS AND LOCAL LEGISLATION.

A SELECT Committee of the House of Commons has lately been employed in examining all private Bills promoted by local authorities which create powers different from those conferred by general Acts of Parliament. Eight municipal improvement Bills were referred to them, and they report that all of them contain abundant illustration of the rapid growth and development which has marked private legislation of late years. There are many things which, so far as public law goes, may be done innocently, but cannot be done innocently under the law in force in a particular place. These additional restrictions have been introduced in part out of regard to local convenience, in part from a desire to gain experience which may serve as the foundation of public Acts of general application, and in part from carelessness. A long Bill is brought forward on behalf of some corporation, and, as there is no one to offer any opposition, its provisions are accepted after a very perfunctory and imperfect examination. The Committee recommend that in future this third head of explanation should no longer be tolerated, and that some step should be taken by the House of Commons to secure more uniform and stringent supervision of the unopposed clauses in private Bills. The order of reference directs the Committee to make a special report in respect of any provisions not found in the general law which the Committee may sanction, together with the reasons on which the recommendations are founded. It cannot be said that the Committee have interpreted this last instruction in too liberal a spirit. All that they do by way of assigning reasons is to quote the precedents of twenty-three urban districts in which some or all of the proposed regulations have been already adopted by private Acts, and of certain Provisional Order Acts in which similar provisions have been introduced by the Local Government Board. It would have been better if the Committee had taken a somewhat wider view of their duties. They recommend that the clauses which they have sanctioned in the Bills referred to them should in any future amendment of the Public Health Act be extended to all urban sanitary authorities; but they give no reasons for their recommendation. These clauses, excellent as upon examination they may prove to be, are not in all cases such as ought to be accepted without careful scrutiny; and one object, at least, of referring these private Bills to a Select Committee was to enable the House of Commons to come to a conclusion upon the merits of the powers with which the local authorities seek to be invested. From this point of view the Report of the Committee does very little. It simply advises that some of the powers asked for shall be granted, and that others shall be refused.

When we turn to the provisions which it is proposed not only to insert in the private Bills referred to the Committee, but in all future editions of the Public Health Acts, we meet at once with one which stands in need of very much more discussion than it has yet received. In order to secure that due notice shall be given to the urban sanitary authority of the existence of infectious disease within their jurisdiction, it is provided, not merely that the occupier, or person having the control, of any house in which a case of infectious disease occurs shall at once give notice of it to the Medical Officer of Health, but that every medical practitioner attending on or called in to visit such inmate shall at once fill up and send to the Medical Officer of Health at his office a certificate stating the nature of the disease from which his patient is suffering. By way of inducement to medical practitioners to forward this certificate, the sanitary authority is to pay a fee of half-a-crown for every certified case occurring in private practice, and a fee of a shilling for every case occurring in any public institution; and any doctor wilfully omitting to furnish a certificate shall be fined forty shillings. The Committee do not seem to be aware that this provision has been strongly opposed by the medical profession. That is not, of course, an adequate reason for condemning the plan. There are examples in all professions of similar unwillingness to have public duties cast on them, and yet the duties objected to, when cast on them, have been discharged with great advantage to the community. But a strong professional objection is an element in the question that undoubtedly deserves full consideration, and this is precisely what the unwillingness of doctors to be converted into registrars of infectious disease has not yet received. It might have received it, therefore, with great advantage at the hands of this Committee. They might have taken the evidence of medical men, and so got at the real nature of the objection which they feel towards the regulation

which it is now proposed to make universal whenever the Local Government Board can get a chance of passing a Bill through the House of Commons. This dislike of the doctors may really spring from the troublesome character of the work imposed on them; but that is not the reason they themselves assign. Their plea is that such a regulation will defeat its own purpose. It may in some cases promote the proper notification of infectious diseases, but in a much larger number it will tend to prevent these diseases from being properly treated. Before a doctor can certify to the existence of infectious disease he must be in attendance upon the sufferer. Now, to be known to have infectious disease in your house very often involves a very serious money loss. Will a man who is suffering, or who has a child suffering, from what promises to be a slight attack of infectious disease be so likely to call in a doctor promptly when he knows that to do so is tantamount to publishing his sad case to the world as when, if he is inclined to keep it secret, he has only not to take the doctor's advice to send notice of the fact to the Medical Officer? The contention of the profession is that he will be much less likely to call in a doctor when the new law has been made universal than he is now, when, except in a few towns, it is only proposed. It is clearly not to the advantage of the community to make it the interest of the whole population that lives by its labour not to have recourse to a doctor if it can possibly do without him. It may possibly appear upon consideration that no such consequence is likely to follow from the adoption of the proposed rule; but at present both the doctors and the community have reason to complain that this has been taken for granted without consideration. The duty has been imposed on medical practitioners, not by a public Act of Parliament, which would have received its full share of discussion, but by a series of private Acts, applying, not to the whole community, but to this or that town, which have undergone no proper discussion. To the recommendation of the Committee that their new rule shall be embodied in a Bill to amend the Public Health Acts no objection can be made. Such a Bill will be properly debated, and the doctors will have an opportunity of stating their objections at length. If Parliament then thinks fit to lay this new duty upon them, it will do so with its eyes open and with full knowledge of what it is about. The recommendation that this same rule shall be inserted in the various local improvement Bills referred to the Committee stands on a different footing. It is impossible to debate a general provision of this kind on the second reading of a private Bill. It is true that the rule is copied from the Manchester and some other Provisional Order Acts. But this only supplies additional evidence as to the impropriety of introducing matters of this kind into Bills to which Parliament ordinarily pays so little attention. Here is one large town after another—Manchester, Newcastle, Bolton, Blackburn—imposing this duty upon the medical profession without even stopping to inquire what the objections of the profession are, and what weight ought to be attached to them. So long as Parliament did not know that the doctors had anything to say against the proposal, the omission was natural. The proposed regulation seemed rational enough on the surface. Now that it has this knowledge, the case is completely altered. It ought not to concede these powers to any local authority, unless it has satisfied itself that they can be conceded without any resulting mischief. It will do these ardent Corporations no harm to wait until the doctors have been heard, and Parliament has decided whether the proposed regulation shall or shall not be added to the sanitary legislation of the country at large.

RELIGIOUS PROCESSIONS.

IT was pointed out the other day, in connexion with the case of the Salvation Army brought by appeal before the Court of Queen's Bench, that if one object of their processions through the streets was to attract attention, as no doubt it is, a motive which is common to all processions, secular and religious, could hardly be considered an unlawful or objectionable one. Of the Salvation Army we have spoken elsewhere; our present aim is to say a word on the subject of religious processions which is thus brought afresh into prominence from a somewhat unexpected quarter. It has been usual to assign a peculiarly Catholic or even Popish character to such a ceremonial, and Catholic in one sense of course it is, as having come into use in the Church at least a thousand years before the Reformation, probably earlier. But we have not now to learn for the first time that Protestants of the most advanced type have found it expedient in this as in other particulars to borrow—*mutatis mutandis* no doubt—a custom which is not even exclusively religious, and is shown by abundant passages in the Old Testament to have found a place in the Jewish as well as in nearly all Pagan rituals, long before the introduction of Christianity into the world. It may seem at first sight strange and even absurd that people should, as an objector might put it, walk about to sing hymns or say their prayers, instead of kneeling or standing quietly, like reasonable beings who are engaged in a serious business and are not enacting a pantomime. But the argument really proves too much; it is just as fatal to processions, good or bad, of Fenians, Freemasons, Odd Fellows, Chartists, and other aggregations political or social, as to ecclesiastical ceremonial. And the fact is that a common instinct dictates all alike. It was natural for the Church, whether Jewish or Christian, to adopt this outward expression alike of

penitence or of joy, just as the triumphal procession which wound its way to the Capitol or the graver solemnities of the *Suovetaurilia*—which also included a procession—had seemed fitly to befit the majesty of Republican or Imperial Rome. We purposely emphasize this double aspect of the usage, as adapted for the expression either of sorrow or of joy, and it is sufficient to point in illustration of it to the familiar contrast of a marriage and a funeral procession, the Wedding March and the Dead March in *Snæd*. It is not simply for the sake of making a display—of publicly testifying, as it were, exultation or anguish before God and man, though this feeling does no doubt come in—but also as giving spontaneous utterance to the inward musings which “at the last,” as the psalmist says, crave outward and cognizable expression. This sentiment, just as much as the natural and creditable desire to rally recruits to their standard, inspired the mediæval Flagellants of whom we spoke on a former occasion and inspires the Salvationists now. As the march past or the triumphal entry into a conquered capital is no mere idle form, but serves to brace the energies and stimulate the ardour and *esprit de corps* of an army, so a religious procession is a symbol and sustaining force of the life of the Militant Church.

If we turn to the history of processions in the Christian ritual, we shall find the same dual character and significance of the usage maintained which is observed elsewhere. There is some obscurity about its first beginning, and for obvious reasons it could only be practised under very limited conditions during the ages of persecution. It is probable however that processions of the clergy took place within the walls of the churches before the conversion of the Empire; minute directions as to the order and equipment of the sacred ministers on entering and leaving church and at certain points of the service may be found in Latin rituals still extant of the eighth century. But there is evidence much earlier, in the middle of the fourth century, of public processions through the streets both in East and West, and this seems to show that as soon as the Church was free, so to say, to emerge from the Catacombs, her ministers came forth to view in the processional order, both festal and penitential, which had been already observed in private; *incessu patuit dea*. St. Basil refers to processional litanies in his own diocese, and St. Ambrose to psalms chanted in procession at Milan on the festivals of martyrs, while at Constantinople rival processions of Catholics and Arians paraded the streets carrying crosses and lighted tapers; and as long as the primitive custom survived of administering public baptism to catechumens in a body at Easter and Whitsuntide, processions of the newly baptized clothed in white and burning lights were held for seven days afterwards both in the Eastern and Western Church; hence the Sunday after Easter, or Low Sunday, is still called in the Roman ritual *Dominica in Albis*. St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of this as a beautiful sight, “lighting up the night with a fiery blaze.” The ordinary processions on fixed occasions seem, however, at first to have taken more generally of a penitential or deprecatory than of a jubilant character. Thus the procession on St. Mark’s Day and on the three Rogation days, still observed in the Latin rite, were for the chanting of litanies, the former perhaps being substituted for the “*candida pompa*,” which of old traversed the streets of Rome on April 25, to supplicate the goddess Robigo for the preservation of the fruits of the earth, as we learn from Ovid and Pliny. The Rogation litanies and processions were first instituted at Vienna in Gaul in the fifth century by Mamercus, when his episcopal city had suffered from earthquakes, but the solemnity became an annual one and spread rapidly throughout Western Christendom. In 511 the Council of Orleans decreed its universal observance, and two centuries later the Council of Cloveshoe ordered it to be maintained in England “according to the custom of our forefathers,” and also directed St. Mark’s litanies to be sung as in the Roman usage; at Rome the Rogation days were not observed before the close of the eighth century. The Procession of the Holy Sacrament in church on Maundy Thursday, supposed to represent the passing of Christ from the Supper room to the Garden of Gethsemane, was of later introduction, and the more elaborate and festive procession of *Corpus Christi*, or the *Fête Dieu* as it is called in France, only came into use with the festival itself in the thirteenth century. This ceremony, as it is, or was very recently, practised in Roman Catholic countries is far the most solemn and picturesque of all the outdoor processions; at Vienna and Munich it was, and we believe still is, the custom for the sovereign to follow the Host bare-headed, when borne through the streets of his capital by the Archbishop and the whole body of the local clergy in their richest vestments. In country parishes similar processions, of course on a humbler scale, do or did perambulate the fields on *Corpus Christi* day, altars being erected at various spots in the open air where a short service is held. Public processions were also from an early age enjoined, as may be gathered from the laws of Justinian, before laying the foundation-stone of a new church and at its dedication when completed. And on special occasions of public need or calamity, such as inundations of rain near harvest time, or an outbreak of plague, or a threatened invasion of the enemy, it was customary to have litanies sung in procession, when the relics of saints were generally carried. These were of course, like our modern “Days of Humiliation and Fasting” for the cholera, intended as a penitential observance. Thus again St. Augustine and his monks advanced to their first meeting with King Ethelbert in the Isle of Thanet, and afterwards made their entrance into Canterbury, chanting the Rogation litanies in procession. Hence

perhaps the solemn observance of the Rogation days became from the first a recognized institution in the Old-English Church. And there is evidence in the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth and the recorded practice of men like Hooker and George Herbert that it survived the Reformation, though no longer prescribed in the ritual. To this day indeed it has a kind of irregular survival, disjoined from its proper date and meaning, in the custom of “beating the bounds” on Ascension day.

It was no doubt in great measure to its imposing scenic effect, its tendency to attract, to awe, and to impress even a careless spectator, that this usage of processional hymns and chants, common in some form to all the great religions of antiquity, owed its origin. The poet is speaking of a penitential rite solemnized for the benefit of “pilgrim chiefs, in sad array,” but his words would bear a wider application, when he speaks of the awe-inspiring grandeur of the spectacle, as—

. . . slow up the dim aisle afar,
With sable cowl and scapular,
And snow-white stole, in order due,
The holy fathers, two and two,
In long procession came.

The Puritan objection to religious processions, on which Hooker comments, is simply part of the *crambe decies repetita* of the argument against all outward forms and ceremonies in religion, and is based on the same radical fallacy of supposing that there can be no spiritual religion which does not treat men, being what they are, as pure incorporeal spirits. It was answered in a rough sort of way by Charles Wesley, when he said that there could be no reason why the devil should have all the good tunes. The early Church acted on the same common-sense view of the matter, and saw no reason why the devil—who was universally believed by Christians of that day to be the real object of Pagan idolatrous worship, as is intimated in Milton’s Christmas Hymn—should have a monopoly of graceful or impressive rites. And just as e.g. the Solstitia and Lupercalia were converted into Christian festivals, so too the ceremonial use of flowers, candles, incense, lustral water, and other symbolic adjuncts of the Pagan, as also in many instances of the Jewish ritual, were adapted to the service of the Church, and conspicuous among them was the custom of religious processions. To object to them on that ground would not be more reasonable than to object to the employment of music, or ministerial vestments, or consecrated churches, for Christian worship. But we are not concerned here to reproduce an argument which has been pretty thoroughly worked out in the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. We are simply stating, not expounding or defending, a principle familiar to all ritualists—we use the word in its proper sense of liturgical scholars, not in its clumsy misapplication as a party nickname—as having materially influenced the gradual elaboration of the external worship of the Church. How far the principle has been wisely applied in this or that particular instance, and in what degree its actual or possible abuse should limit its legitimate use, is another matter on which there is no need to enter here. But it is a little amusing to note how the usage of processions, which was so much “biten at” by the Puritans of Hooker’s day, appears at present to one large section at least of their spiritual descendants of such vital interest to the cause of Gospel truth that they are prepared to risk fine and imprisonment not for resisting but for upholding it as an integral portion of Christian worship.

M. LÉON SAY’S PREDICTIONS.

IN speaking at an Agricultural Show dinner at St. Quentin last week, M. Léon Say said that the prospects of the French harvest are so good that France will probably not need to import any wheat next year; that therefore money will be very cheap, trade will be very prosperous, the revenue will be abundant; and that, in consequence of all this, he will be able to reduce taxation, and, further, to effect a modification in the debt. This latter statement is understood to mean that he intends to convert the Five per Cent. Rentes. Strange to say, the speech, though taking so sanguine a view of the material prospects of France, has caused a fall upon the Paris Bourse, and generally has discomposed French speculators. The explanation is that the conversion of the Five per Cent. would compel those who have speculated in them to submit to a loss of either capital or interest, and that the prospect seriously discourages them. Speculation in the Five per Cent. has for a long time been ripe in France; the price at one time was run up as high as 120; and even when M. Léon Say spoke last week, those Rentes were at a premium of over 15 per cent. If, therefore, the holders of the Rentes are unwilling to accept a lower rate of interest, they must submit to a loss of 15 per cent. in their capital, while, if they shrink from this, they will probably have to agree to a loss of interest of from 20 to 30 per cent. In either case the prospect is not agreeable, and the number of persons concerned in the matter is so great that they influence the whole of the Bourse. In fact, the Five per Cents. have for some time been regarded as the barometer of the Bourse, and whatever affects them affects the whole market. It will be recollected that, when M. Gambetta took office, he was understood to intend the conversion of the Five per Cents., and that the fall in their price which followed was the immediate precursor of the January panic. When M. Léon Say accepted the

Ministry of Finance, he did so on condition, amongst other things, that the Five per Cents should not be converted. The speculators, therefore, at once took heart, in the hope that they had secured a respite of some years at the least. But little more than four months have now elapsed, and the question of conversion is once more brought forward by the very Minister whose accession they had welcomed as a postponement of this dreaded measure. When M. Léon Say adopts a portion of the financial programme of M. Gambetta, it is evident that the measure cannot be long resisted, and the Bourse consequently is disheartened. M. Léon Say's organ in the press has attempted to explain away the inconsistency which a few months ago stipulated that there was to be no conversion, and now announces that conversion is imminent; but the attempt is not very successful. And, in truth, his best justification is that conversion is desirable in the interests of France, and can be opposed only in the interests of speculators. In round numbers the capital of the Five per Cent. Rentes amounts to 274 millions sterling. If M. Léon Say cuts down the interest only one per cent, he will effect a saving of very nearly 2½ millions sterling; while, if he is able to refund at 3½ per cent, the saving will considerably exceed four millions. Either saving would enable the Minister to reduce some of the oppressive taxation now imposed, or, if it should be preferred, would allow of a much larger sum than now being devoted to popular education.

To the French people at large, and to foreigners, the other points of M. Léon Say's speech are much more important. For a series of four or five years French harvests have been deficient, and France in consequence has had to import very large quantities of food from other countries. To pay for this food, more especially for wheat, she has had to export gold. The drain of gold from the Bank of France thus occasioned has been so great that towards the close of last year the whole stock of the metal held by that institution was under 24 millions sterling. The Bank, it will be borne in mind, has branches in every department of France, and it is obliged to keep some amount of gold at each of these. The quantity of gold, therefore, at the head office was very small; so small, indeed, that apprehensions were entertained in France, as well as abroad, that the attempt to maintain bi-metallism must fail, and that France would be forced to adopt the single silver standard. The Bank became alarmed; it raised its rate of discount, and refused to pay out gold; and since then the current has changed, until now it holds over 37½ millions sterling in gold. This is an increase of nearly 14 millions from the lowest point; but, as we have already said, it has been attained by the refusal of the Bank to pay out gold except on onerous conditions, so that to a certain extent bi-metallism is suspended in France, gold not being obtainable in any amount desired at the Bank of France. If now, however, the harvests prove as abundant as M. Léon Say expects, France will have to export no gold this year in purchasing wheat, and consequently there will be no drain from that country to the United States. Further, if the wine harvest is good, France will have to buy very much less wine from Spain and Italy than she has had to purchase of late years, and in this way also she will have to pay away less gold. The drain of gold from France will therefore cease; the Bank of France will be able once more to pay out gold freely, and the old monetary system will be restored. It is probable, too, especially if the wine harvest is good, that the exports of France of all kinds will exceed her imports, and that consequently she will receive gold, instead of paying it away as of late years. Usually, until within the past three, or four years, what is called the balance of trade was in favour of France—that is to say, there was more due to her from other countries than she owed to them; and as she was able to take payment in whatever form she pleased, usually gold flowed in to her. If M. Léon Say's expectations are fulfilled, she will be in this position again in the coming year; and her financial difficulties will thus draw to an end. Of course the Bank of France is still weighted with an immense mass of silver, which it is apparently unable to get rid of in any way, and that difficulty will remain whatever the harvest may be. But as the Bank of France is able to issue notes against its silver, the difficulty is not serious so long as the stock of gold is large enough for all international purposes.

As regards ourselves, the important part of M. Léon Say's speech lies in the anticipation that France will not need to import wheat from abroad; in other words, that during the coming agricultural year France will not be a competitor with England in the wheat markets of the world. According to present appearances—at least until the recent inopportune change in the weather—the wheat harvest all over the world will be large, and therefore wheat will be cheap. But, if France does not need to buy any wheat, the price will be very greatly reduced. When England and France are competing in the markets of the world, they raise prices each against the other; but when France produces enough for her own needs, we are practically the only great buyers, and therefore we fix prices. As far, therefore, as one can see thus early, and subject to the contingencies indicated by the unfavourable weather of the last few days, the price of wheat promises to be low in the coming year. Food, that is, will be cheap; and, so far as the necessities of life are concerned, the wages of the working classes will really buy more than they do now. The working classes, therefore, will have a larger surplus, even if no rise of wages takes place, than they have now to spend upon other things than the mere necessities of life. It is to be expected that this will give

a great impetus to trade, and therefore it seems probable that M. Léon Say will be borne out when he says that 1883 will be an exceptional year. The French peasant farmers, for the first time for a long series of years, will, it is hoped, have abundant crops; they will therefore be better off than they have been, and they will be able to save more. Their savings will go partly into the land, and partly into Stock Exchange securities, and their expenditure will give a stimulus to trade. With ourselves, the working classes unfortunately save little. If their wages go further than usual, they spend the surplus upon what to them are either comforts or luxuries; but the expenditure will give an immense stimulus to trade, and highly prosperous trade will in turn act upon the prices of Stock Exchange securities. Provided, therefore, that the harvests of the world are as good as, with the exceptions above named, they have thus far promised to be, M. Léon Say's prediction that next year will be exceptional is likely to be borne out.

THE OPERAS.

THE production, for the first time for nearly fifty years in London, of *Euryanthe* at Drury Lane, will be admitted by some people to be at least as important an event as the production of which we gave some account last week of a work until then unheard in London, by the composer whose inspiration certainly owes not a little to the influence of Weber. We use the word inspiration advisedly, by way of indicating that, however much Herr Wagner may have found suggestions, and more than suggestions, in the work of his predecessors, he has not the less that quality of genius which can turn such borrowing to the best account, and make of it, and with it, something to which one might be more content to give the name of original if it were not for the stupid outcry of some of the Wagnerians against the possibility of their idol owing anything to any man. That, to take one striking instance afforded by the production of Weber's opera above-named, *Lohengrin* owes much to *Euryanthe* will hardly be doubted by any except the extreme Wagnerians, or those who are more apt to consider music in regard to its harmonic progressions than in regard to its melodic forms. In saying this we take no account of the remarkable dramatic likeness which also exists between the two works, and in respect of which *Lohengrin*, no doubt, has the advantage over *Euryanthe*. *Euryanthe* as a play has, or perhaps rather suggests, fine capabilities which seem to have been discerned and turned to excellent account by the writer and composer of *Lohengrin*. It might, of course, be argued, and argued with some show of reason, that the coincidence is a mere coincidence; that the two legends resemble each other only as all legends which contain an innocent injured maiden, a male and female villain, a benevolent tyrant, and a chorus of nobles and retainers, must resemble each other; but for the curious fact that, consciously or unconsciously, Herr Wagner has given in *Lohengrin* some striking parallel passages, both in his situations and in his music to the most prominent scenes of *Euryanthe*. At one time, in the chorus after Adolar's wager with Lysiart, one thinks naturally of the orchestral movement and chorus which follow in *Lohengrin* close upon the first discernment of the portent in the distance; at another, in the next scene, it is impossible to avoid thinking—but here the parallel is more dramatic than musical—of Elsa and Ortrud when one watches *Euryanthe* and *Eglantine*. Again, this duet is followed by trumpets announcing the break of dawn, and by the presentation on the stage of the gradual meeting and greeting of groups of people who wake with the waking day. Nothing could well be more different than the writing of Weber and of Herr Wagner for these trumpets; but the fact remains that the coincidence is an odd one, if a slight one. It was perhaps unnecessary to thrust it upon the attention by employing the same back-cloth for both scenes. Yet again, in the next scene, we have a duet between Lysiart and Eglantine which cannot but be recognized as the germ, to say no more, of the duet between Telramund and Ortrud. Here, too, the scheme of the music, though its details differ greatly, is essentially the same. Weber set himself to write gloomy recitatives for gloomy characters; and this is what Herr Wagner has done in the corresponding scene, carrying his principle, however, so far as to make the music not only gloomy, but even repellent. Here we may note, though other instances abound in the work, that Herr Wagner is not, as his more fanatical admirers would have us believe, the inventor of the peculiar form of accompanied recitative which is amongst the things that make his work so distinct from that of the Italian school. The use of this, and the abandonment of unaccompanied recitative, are, like some other things, common to *Euryanthe* and to *Lohengrin*. However, it is needless to pursue a subject which need not have been brought into notice at all but for the perverse fanaticism of people whose position is practically that, if one composer's work is good—which in the case of Herr Wagner we are by no means concerned to deny—therefore no other composer's works can be equally good—which we are by no means willing to admit.

The plot of *Euryanthe* is, as we have indicated, feeble enough, in spite of the fine situations which in more skilful hands than those of the librettist might have been turned to impressive uses. In the first act we have the brave and virtuous hero Adolar singing the praises, in presence of the King and his Court, of Euryanthe, his betrothed. Lysiart, the villainous knight, scoffs at

his belief in woman's loyalty, and wagers his lands and titles against Adolar's that he will gain Euryanthe's love. In the second scene of the act Euryanthe appears, and in a moment of expansiveness confides to Eglantine, her seeming friend and real rival, a secret only known to herself and to Adolar, who has solemnly charged her to keep the secret. The secret is that the spirit of Adolar's sister Emma is unable to rest until the poison-ring with which she destroyed her own life on hearing of her lover's death is "bath'd in tears of injured innocence." Presently Lysiart, surprising Eglantine's confession of jealous hatred of Euryanthe, joins forces with her, and armed with the mystic ring which Eglantine steals from the vault, seems to make good his title to have won the wager. Euryanthe, protesting innocence, is dragged out by Adolar, and, after fall of the curtain, reappears with him (in a new dress) in a lonely forest. Then having slain, off the stage, a monstrous serpent, he leaves her half fainting, to be discovered by the King and a hunting party. The last scene of the opera is naturally devoted to clearing matters up, and ensuring the discomfiture of Lysiart, who appropriately ends his stage career by stabbing Eglantine, who has come out of the castle gate with him at the head of a bridal procession.

Of the music the best known pieces are the overture and the hunting chorus in the last act, which is a far finer piece of work than the more popular and more jingly hunting chorus in the *Freischütz*. A striking instance of Weber's dramatic instinct and skill in operatic writing is found in the fact that this chorus, instead of following so as to produce an effect of shock close upon Euryanthe's fainting, is preceded by a long and beautiful orchestral passage, towards the end of which the horns are gradually introduced. But throughout the opera, which contains not one unmelodious passage, the composer's dramatic feeling is as easily recognized as his musical inspiration. It is, indeed, surprising that so much truly dramatic effect should have been got out of a libretto in which the author, by trifling away her opportunities, threw every difficulty in the way of the composer's making the music dramatic—as, in spite of the words, he did make it. As one instance of purely dramatic music, one may point to Lysiart's jeering and sarcastic recitatives in the first scene, and, in another sense, to Adolar's beautiful song which preceded them. Amongst many beautiful choruses we may notice specially the first chorus of women, and the chorus in the second act which is employed more or less as an accompaniment to Euryanthe's singing, as it is employed by a widely different composer with so much effect in the bed-room scene of *La Sonnambula*, without recourse being had to the modern trick of singing *à bouche fermée*. But, indeed, to go at length through the many beauties of the opera—beauties, let us repeat, which are never without their proper dramatic bearing and effect—would be to write a review as long as the libretto itself. The effect of the work is certainly to make one long to hear it again. As to the conducting, Herr Richter's extraordinary command over his orchestra, and extraordinary skill in varying its tone and power, have never been better shown. The choruses were as steady and safe as possible, and the women's chorus was beautifully fresh. Fr. Sucher's Euryanthe is perhaps even better than her Elsa. Her singing and acting, especially in the latter part of the opera, were admirable; she had full perception of the pathos of the part, and in her prayer for deliverance managed to reproduce, without repeating, the poetical and visionary exaltation of Elsa's prayer before the arrival of the swan. Frau Peschka-Leutner, who appeared as Eglantine, still retains the excellent method which always belonged to her style, and acted with something more than intelligence. For Herr Gurn's Lysiart, forcible and yet restrained, we have nothing but praise. His delivery of the words "Bei Rache, Wuth und Gluth des ew'gen Hasses, ja!" was a striking piece of singing, phrasing, and acting. Herr Nachbaur at rare intervals made a pleasing use of a true tenor voice; but for the most part his intonation was faulty, his phrasing radically wrong, and his acting feeble. The singing of Bertha by Fr. Wiedermann deserves more than a word of praise.

Mme. Pauline Lucca has lately appeared as Marguerite in *Faust* at Covent Garden. Those who can remember Mme. Lucca's brilliant career in London some years ago may remember that, though every one admitted that her performance of this character was most charming, yet it was objected by many critics, and not without reason, that she did not represent either the character according to Goethe, or the Marguerite of the librettists, or the character indicated by the music. We now find no diminution of the personal charm of the performance, but we find the character conceived in a manner which we think ought to disarm all objectors. Mme. Lucca still shows us Marguerite as a village girl, in which she is artistically right; but the indication of rusticity is now confined to the earlier part of the garden-scene, and, as soon as the passion of the character appears, that passion alone is shown. It is almost impossible to criticize, or even to describe, Mme. Lucca's performance. The art is so subtle and so perfect that it is hardly possible to follow the means used to produce the effects. There is no special or daring business introduced; the part is simply acted in an apparently unobtrusive way, but the effect of this acting is very great. It is surprising, after so many years, to find that Mme. Lucca's voice still retains that undefinable quality known as freshness. Time and hard work have made it necessary for her to slightly force some of the upper notes; but in the whole of her voice, which is still under perfect control, there is that exquisite suggestion of youth which delighted our ears so many seasons ago; and, above all, Mme.

Lucca still retains her almost magical power of expressing emotion with her voice without marring the time, or suggesting false accents belonging neither to the time nor the phrasing. Her singing of the beautiful passage, "Morirà, morirà la cara sorella mia," in the garden-scene was a marvel of pathos, though the phrase was sung as it is written, and it was impossible to detect any help to the music given by gesture or play of facial expression. On this occasion Mme. Lucca was suffering from a cough; but yet, not only were tender, playful, and delicate passages beautifully sung, but there was a full reserve of power for the last act. It is too much to say that in the scene of this act Mme. Lucca stands, and always stood alone, Mme. Tietjens, her only rival in this part of the opera, having played it but too seldom. It is rare that a singer has such command of different styles and such dramatic flexibility as to be satisfactory both in the earlier parts of the opera, where feminine sweetness, deep love, and womanly grief have to be shown, and also in this great outburst of heroic tragedy. In the garden-scene, Mme. Lucca had much to contend against in the dramatic incapacity of Signor Frapolli. We have seen him represent the part of Faust in a good and workmanlike manner; but on this occasion he was by no means good, and his trick of raising one arm at a time at regular intervals, involving, as it did, the necessity of passing Marguerite's hand from one hand to the other, went far to make the most tender situation ridiculous. His singing also was far from satisfactory, and his mangling of "Salve dimora" would have been painful had it not been redeemed by the touch of humour suggested by his singing the air to the audience with uneasy half-glances round at the cottage. M. Gailhard played Mephistopheles, and has improved his performance by somewhat reducing the buffoon element. He sang the "Dio dell' Or" excellently, and his acting in the Kermesse scene had a touch of originality. Signor Devries sang Valentine. He has a remarkably beautiful voice, and is a fairly good vocalist, but has a strong tendency to sentimentalism in musical expression, and showed no very great dramatic power. He also fell into the common fault of taking "Dio possente" in dirge time. Mlle. Stahl played Siebel. Her performance was curiously unequal. For instance, in the "Flower song," she appeared to have a voice of great beauty, whilst during most of the rest of the opera, and especially in the air "Quando a te lieta," she seemed unable to produce any tone at all. It would be unfair to give any decided judgment on her powers from her performance in this part. The chorus, except in the first act, was extremely good, and the band under M. Dupont was excellent, but for the one glaring fault of coarseness and too great strength in the brass and percussion instruments.

The stage management is improving. Some effort is being made to vivify the chorus; as yet, we must confess, the result is not very pleasing; but we hope that the course of attempting to galvanize them into life may be persevered in, when, perhaps, the Covent Garden stage may become once more what it was in the hands of the late Mr. Augustus Harris. It is curious that, in spite of the obvious intelligence at work on the stage, we are still offended by the great and poetic situation at the end of the first act being destroyed by the nervous anxiety of singers and conductor to give ample time for the preparation of a trick of which a second-rate mechanical conjuror would have good reason to be ashamed.

ASCOT RACES.

As long as 14,000l. are given to be run for at Ascot it is likely to continue to be the most successful race-meeting in the world. But on the late anniversary the attendance is believed to have been considerably below the average, and it is stated in the *Morning Post* that "the receipts of the present meeting, both inside and outside the stands, show a falling-off of between two and three thousand pounds compared with those of 1881." We have already noticed the Prince of Wales's Stakes and the Ascot Stakes, the two principal events of the opening day. Lord Bradford's success in each of these races was deservedly popular. The meeting began with the Trial Stakes, for which Valentino was the favourite. He cantered in half a length in front of Mistake, and Mr. L. de Rothschild and Fordham had the honour of winning the first race of the meeting. The bookmakers refused to take shorter odds than 3 to 1 on Tristan for the Gold Vase, which seemed an extravagant price when Chippendale's best form was taken into consideration; but the result fully justified the state of the betting, as Tristan won by half a dozen lengths. It is probable that Chippendale will never again attain his old form, as his training is conducted under difficulties on account of his tendency to break bloodvessels. Lilac was made the favourite for the Biennial for two-year-olds, but a colt called the Duke, by Barbillion out of a sister to Exeter, made the running from end to end, and won by a length and a half. For the Maiden Two-year-old Plate Cannon was most fancied, and he made the running until half-way up the hill, where he tried to bolt out of the course, and allowed Prince Baththyany's Fulmen to pass him and win by three lengths. Backers had had a good day on the whole until the last race, when they made a sad blunder by laying 7 to 2 on Limestone, who was cleverly beaten by Privateer.

There was every promise of interesting racing on the Wednesday. Shotover, the winner of the Derby, Geheimnis, the winner of the Oaks, and St. Marguerite, the winner of the One Thousand, were all to take part in different races. The only drawback

seemed to be that in each instance the race would probably be something very like a walk over for one or other of the flying fillies. In the first race, the Ascot Derby, this was practically the case, for Shotover passed her opponents as if they were standing still the moment that Cannon roused her, and it was evident that the four lengths by which she won might have been considerably increased if her jockey had so wished. She was giving 13 lbs. to Battlefield, a good-looking colt belonging to Lord Bradford which had been backed for the St. Leger. There was a report that he was as good as Quicklime, which cannot have been true; but if he is within a stone of Quicklime, that horse cannot have much hope of reversing in the St. Leger his previous running with Shotover, as the filly will then be meeting him on 18 lbs. better terms than those under which she beat Battlefield by four lengths in the Ascot Derby.

Confident as backers had been of Shotover's victory in the Ascot Derby, they were even more certain that Geheimniss would be successful in the Fern Hill Stakes. They laid 8 to 1 on the filly's chance, and many bookmakers refused even such liberal odds as these, believing that she could not possibly be beaten unless she tumbled down. At the foot of the hill Lord Rosebery's Narcissa was leading when the favourite challenged her; but Geheimniss was evidently in difficulties, and, after a hard struggle, Narcissa won by a head. The winner is a two-year-old filly by Speculum, out of Gardenia, belonging to Lord Rosebery. It would be well for backers if they were more careful to remember that weight tells far more up a hill than on level ground, and, although 26 lbs. is the recognized allowance for a three-year-old to make to a two-year-old in June over five furlongs, we are inclined to think that on such a trying course as Ascot the two-year-olds have a little the best of it. But this would not account for the three-year-old filly Sing-Song running within three-quarters of a length of Geheimniss at even weights. Still, Sing-Song showed plenty of good form last year, if not sufficient to lead one to expect her to run so near a filly like Geheimniss. Twenty starters came out for the Royal Hunt Cup. The favourite was Mr. Gerard's Sweetbread, a three-year-old colt, carrying 6 st. 4 lbs. He came away at the road; and, after two or three horses had tried to overhaul him, he increased his lead, and won easily by three lengths. This race was not so interesting as usual, and there is no need for further comment upon its details. The Coronation Stakes followed, and this was looked upon as a third certainty for one of the flying fillies. Even after the terrible lesson that the backers had received in the Fern Hill Stakes, they laid 9 to 2 very freely on St. Marguerite. The running was made by Rozelle, who had never yet won a race, and had consequently an allowance of 7 lbs. As St. Marguerite had a penalty of 7 lbs., this made a difference of a stone between the pair. When the field rounded the turn into the straight, the four fillies closed up and raced together in a cluster. It was then naturally supposed that Rozelle was done with, but before reaching the Spagnolletti board she had recovered the lead, and St. Marguerite's jockey was hard at work with his whip. When the winning-post was reached, Rozelle was a couple of lengths in front of Leonora, who beat St. Marguerite by a head for second place. As we have already hinted, a stone on a course like Ascot has a far greater effect than a stone on a flat course; but it must not be forgotten that Shotover gave Battlefield 13 lbs. and sex and beat him in a canter by four lengths, even over the severe Ascot finish. This running of St. Marguerite's would therefore appear to be indifferent; but we cannot believe it to be her true form, and we are the more inclined to this opinion because we observed that when stripped for the race she sweated a good deal. In each of the races in which the crack fillies were defeated, 20 to 1 was laid against the winner. After two such reverses as they had received in the Fern Hill Stakes and the Coronation Stakes, one would have supposed that backers would have had enough of it; but they laid even money more gaily than ever for the next race on The Duke, who had won the Biennial Stakes on the previous day. It is not pleasant for backers to see their champion leading, about a distance from home, with his jockey hard at work, while another horse is at his girths upon which Archer is sitting perfectly motionless; but this was the case with the backers of The Duke in the race under discussion. Long before reaching the winning-post Archer "came," and the race was soon added to his long list of victories. The winner, whose name is Symphony, is one of the first of Petrarch's stock that has won a race. Backers contrived to select the winners of the last two races, but they must have had anything but a satisfactory day. A man who backed the first favourite in every race to win him 100*l.* would have lost about 95*l.* on the day; but if any one had had the good luck to put 100*l.* on the winner of every race, he would have won more than 5,000*l.*

It had been supposed that Marden was a coward; but from his running at Sandown and on the Thursday at Ascot, it would seem that he is a very good horse over five furlongs, and that it is want of staying power rather than want of pluck that has lost him so many races. Odds were laid on Althotas for the All-aged Stakes, and 12 to 1 was laid against Marden; but after making the running all the way Marden won easily by a length and a half. For the Gold Cup the great American champion Foxhall was made the favourite. He was only opposed by Petronel and Faugh-a-Ballagh, two horses belong to the Duke of Beaufort. Faugh-a-Ballagh fulfilled his mission so faithfully that the pace had completely exhausted his stable companion half a mile from home. Foxhall was also beginning to feel the effects of the pace, for Cannon was

hard at work on him before rounding the bend. Faugh-a-Ballagh was still leading at the foot of the hill, but there was just enough left in Foxhall to allow of his speed excelling that of Faugh-a-Ballagh, and within a few yards of the winning-post he caught Faugh-a-Ballagh and won by a neck. When Lord Bradford wins important races, he always seems to win them in pairs. On the Thursday at Epsom he won the Grand Prize and the Royal Stakes; on the Tuesday at Ascot he won the Prince of Wales's Stakes and the Ascot Stakes; and on the Thursday at Ascot he won the St. James's Palace Stakes and the Rous Memorial Stakes. These stakes amounted in all to considerably more than 10,000*l.*, which was a very satisfactory sum to win in three weeks' racing with a week's holiday in the middle. Sachem, who had been third in the Derby, was made favourite for the St. James's Palace Stakes, but Battlefield beat him by a length and a half. Odds were laid on Retreat for the Rous Memorial Stakes, which he won cleverly by three-quarters of a length. Archer rode both Battlefield and Retreat. Tristan won the Biennial without trouble. Thebais, the winner of the Oaks of last year, was among his opponents, but she was scarcely fit and did not even get a place. Rookery was a very hot favourite for the New Stakes for two-year-olds; but the race was won in a canter by six lengths, by Adriana, an own sister to Rozelle. This filly has a great deal of quality, muscle, and power, and unless some accident befalls her she is likely to win many races.

To make up for her disappointment of the previous day, Rookery won the first race of the Friday. Privateer was a strong favourite for the high-weight handicap that followed; but Mr. Leopold de Rothschild's Isabel won by a head, Springtide being second, Amalfi third, and Privateer absolutely last. Privateer had been purchased for 1,000*l.* just before the race. It is seldom that one sees four finer horses together than Foxhall, Petronel, Exeter, and Fiddler, who ran for the Alexandra Plate. The race was considered a certainty for Foxhall, especially after the beating he had given Petronel the day before in the Cup. Exeter made the running to the hotel turn, where he stopped short and tried to bolt to his stables. Then Fiddler led at a great pace, so much so indeed that Foxhall never caught him, and the great American got beaten by half-a-dozen lengths. Fiddler was receiving 5 lbs. from Foxhall, but it was fully a 5 lb. beating. The Americans, however, may boast that Fiddler is by the American horse Preakness. Wokingham, who had won the Wokingham Stakes last year, won it again this year, although he had been by no means a favourite at the start. He must have an extraordinary liking for this course, for he has never won any other race in his life. The Queen's Stand Plate was won by Eastern Princess, the favourite, but by a head only, after a very pretty race with a two-year-old called Kate Craig. Odds were laid on Tristan for the Hardwicke Stakes. He had a grand kicking match with Poulet before taking his preliminary canter, and on his way to the post he stopped altogether, and had to be led up to the other horses. Retreat also had a good kick-up before starting. Tristan made most of the running as far as the bend into the straight, where Sweetbread got up to him, but opposite the stand Tristan made an extra effort, and won by a length; Poulet was third. The racing was brought to an end by Shotover's walking over for the Triennial Stakes.

There was a great deal of interesting racing during the week, but there were very few hardly contested finishes. Although all the four days of the meeting were rainy, there was but little wet during the hours of racing, except on the Friday, and not a single race was run in rain. Some idea of the interest taken in Ascot races may be obtained from the fact that on one day alone 6,500 telegraphic messages were despatched from Ascot. The trains were not so crowded as usual during the Ascot week; but the threatening weather, and the heavy storms that passed over London about the time that people generally make a start for the races, may have been enough to account for this. There has not been so much St. Leger betting at Ascot for some years, and there was an immense amount of heavy gambling on the races of the week. Be the times good or be they bad, people always appear to have money to bet with, and the gambling that went on last week at Ascot put Monte Carlo completely into the shade.

REVIEWS.

THREE HANDBOOKS OF ENGLISH HISTORY.*

WE have before us three books which may be classed together as handbooks of English history, but which differ greatly from each other in style and in merit. Mr. Grant Allen,

* *Early Britain—Anglo-Saxon Britain.* By Grant Allen, B.A. Published under the Direction of the Committee of General Literature and Education appointed by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: Young & Co.

Collins's School Series.—History of the British Empire. With Coloured Maps and Illustrations. New and Enlarged Edition. With Questions and Copious Index. London and Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, & Co. Limited.

A Handbook in Outline of the Political History of England to 1882. Chronologically arranged by Arthur H. Dyke Acland, M.A., Steward of Christ Church, Oxford; and Cyril Ransome, M.A., Professor of Modern Literature and History, Yorkshire College, Leeds. London: Rivingtons. 1882.

with whom we begin, has produced a lively and argumentative little book on *Anglo-Saxon Britain*. For a handbook it is perhaps rather too argumentative and controversial, but it is not the less lively for that. The main points for which Mr. Allen contends are no doubt already familiar to our readers. To put things shortly, he denies that the existing English race is thoroughbred, or anything like thorough-bred. He is one of the strongest believers in the existence of a large infusion of Celtic and pre-Celtic blood "even in the most Teutonic portions of England," and he therefore stands forth as an opponent of those writers whom he terms "the Teutonic champions." To these tenets he adds something which almost seems like personal enmity against the genuine ancient English, or Anglo-Saxons, as he prefers to call them. There is always something of irritation in the manner in which he demonstrates that the Anglo-Saxon, like Shakespeare, is a much overrated man—we do not mean to say that these are his words, but this we take to be his feeling. This irritation is less manifest in this than in some of his previous writings, but still it is there. Further, he is apt to treat with scant reverence those Chronicles which to the "Teutonic champions" are but a little lower than the Bible. He does indeed in one place admit them to be an "invaluable document"; but he considers their accounts of the English Conquest to be mainly mythical, and he has no great admiration for their style, which he terms "bald and meagre." His use of the term "Anglo-Saxon," as applied to the people, he defends on the ground that "it would be inconvenient to use the name of one dominant tribe alone, the English, as equivalent to all the three," Jutes, Saxons, and Angles. As applied to the language, he considers it useful for the purpose of distinguishing "the earliest pure form of the English language from its later modern form." To our mind, any convenience to be found in the use of the term is far outweighed by the disadvantage of drawing a hard and fast line between "Anglo-Saxon" and English, and of obscuring the continuity of our nation and our language. But as Mr. Allen has chosen to use it, we must give him due credit for having warned his readers that "it should be remembered that the expression Anglo-Saxon is purely artificial, and was never used by the people themselves in describing their fellows or their tongue."

Before proceeding further, it may be well to point out, what is often overlooked, that the question so hotly debated between the Teutonic and Celtic champions is to some extent a question of words. It is not really so much the facts that are in dispute as the amount of stress to be laid upon particular facts. Whatever rash expressions may have sometimes been used by too eager disciples of the Teutonic school, no one, we should imagine, seriously contends for the absolute purity of the English race. The Teutonic party, when pressed on the subject of the extermination or extirpation of the Welsh, end by sparing a large number of Welsh women, and even some Welshmen, to exist in a state of slavery or serfdom; and thus they practically yield the point, or at least reduce the question to one of the greater or less amount of Celtic blood infused into the nation. On the other hand, Mr. Allen himself admits that "it is impossible to deny that Mr. Freeman and Canon Stubbs have proved their point as to the thorough Teutonisation of Southern Britain by the English invaders." He allows that "the nation which rose upon the ruins of Roman Britain was, in form and organisation, almost purely English," and that the "Anglo-Saxons . . . have contributed" to the modern English nation "the whole framework of the language, and the whole social and political organisation." "In *institutions*," he elsewhere says, "the Anglo-Saxon has contributed almost everything"—an admission which it is not easy to reconcile with his preceding assertion that "*in civilisation . . . we owe comparatively little to the direct Teutonic influence.*" Surely institutions and government are a part, and a very important part, of what goes to make up civilization. However, it is clear that the question, as we have already intimated when reviewing Mr. Elton's recent work, turns upon the different points of view of the historian and the ethnologist, the latter looking mainly at pedigree, "blood," and physical characteristics, the former laying more stress upon the influence of a predominant language and of political and social supremacy. The following extract shows that Mr. Allen sees this, and can put his case fairly and temperately:

Though there may have been much Welsh blood left, it ran in the veins of serfs and rent-paying churls, who were of no political or social importance. These two aspects of the case should be kept carefully distinct. Had they always been separated, much of the discussion which has arisen on the subject would doubtless have been avoided; for the strongest advocates of the Teutonic theory are generally ready to allow that Celtic women, children, and slaves may have been largely spared; while the Celtic enthusiasts have thought [it?] incumbent upon them to derive English words from Welsh roots, and to trace the origin of English social institutions to Celtic models. The facts seem to indicate that while the modern English nation is largely Welsh in blood, it is wholly Teutonic in form and language. Each of us probably traces back his descent to mixed Celtic and Germanic ancestry; but while the Celts have contributed the material alone, the Teutons have contributed both the material and the form.

At the same time we may ask whether the historian is not justified in treating, for all practical purposes, as Teutonic a nation so thoroughly Teutonized, and whether the existence of persons of "an essentially dark, short, non-Teutonic type" in Anglian districts such as Yorkshire and Lincolnshire is really of much importance to him. To be consistent, moreover, we must remember that these survivors of the dark pre-Celtic race are no

more truly Celtic than they are Teutonic. If we count them as Celts when we find them mixed with Celts and speaking Celtic tongues, we may equally count them as Teutons when we find them intermingled with Teutons and speaking a Teutonic language. On the subject of language, Mr. Allen makes some excellent remarks. If he questions the identity of the modern Englishman with the "Anglo-Saxon," he has no such doubt about his language:—"The relation of Anglo-Saxon to modern English is that of direct parentage, it might almost be said of absolute identity." Indeed, throughout there is a great deal that deserves high praise, though we note a few points for criticism. When he sneers at the "three keels" of Hengest and Horsa as "a ridiculous inadequate number," he has, we think, overlooked what elsewhere he strongly impresses upon his readers, that he is dealing with the history of small communities of barbarians. By his own reckoning, the ancient pirate-boat "might convey about 120 fighting men," and in primitive warfare three hundred and sixty men would be no despicable contingent. It must be remembered, too, that the legend expressly represents the original war-band of Hengest and Horsa as sending home for reinforcements before they undertook the conquest of Kent. In his account of Eadwine's conversion, Mr. Allen tells us that Eadwine assembled a witenagemot "on the banks of the Derwent—for moots were always held in the open air at some sacred spot." This may have been so; but, as we have before remarked when dealing with theories on open-air meetings, Bæda never says whether the meeting in question was indoors or out. Further, Mr. Allen makes Bæda fix the locality of Godmundingham (Goodmanham) "not far from York to the westward." Bæda himself rightly places it *ad orientem*. It is also a slip when Mr. Allen represents Oswiu as succeeding Oswald "as King of Deira (for Bernicia now chose a king of its own)." The names Bernicia and Deira should be transposed.

The second book on our list, an anonymous *History of the British Empire*, in Collins's School Series, is one of the old sort of school-books which we believed to be extinct—a book in which matters of importance are as often as not left out, and unimportant snippings and cuttings of commonplace-books are carefully driven into the pupil's head by means of summaries and strings of leading questions; a book divided into "Roman," "Saxon," "Norman" periods, and so on, with beadrolls of "eminent persons" and "authors" tacked on to the periods or the reigns. It has been brought "down to date"—Treaty of Gandamuk, Battle of Majouba Hill, Irish Land Bill, Tay Bridge accident; it is garnished with historical maps, which are the best thing about it; but in spirit and conception it is the old unregenerate school-book still. Almost at the outset we are confronted with thirty questions relating to the "Religion of the Ancient Britons"—"Mention the three orders of Druids.—What offices were performed by the Druids proper?—Who were the Vates?" and so forth. Every one except the compilers of this class of books is aware by this time that we know hardly anything for certain about British Druidism, and that if we did, it has no practical bearing on our history. In the next batch of questions the unhappy pupil is asked about King Arthur:—"What order of knighthood did he form?" We wonder the teacher does not go on to inquire how Jack the Giant-Killer first distinguished himself, and under what circumstances Tom Thumb was presented at Court. Further on, in the reign of Richard I., he actually does put five questions about Robin Hood and Little John, and is so precise as to fix the exact number of their followers—one hundred, neither more nor less. Robin Hood and Little John, and their forbearance towards "the fair sex," come, we observe, under the head of "General Facts." Edward the Elder, we learn, "enlarged Cambridge University"—in what manner is not explained. In the reign of Harold I. the writer introduces us to "the Earl of Godwin," whom however he is content afterwards to call Earl Godwin. The body of the second Harold is of course sought for by "two monks" and "deposited in Waltham Abbey"; it would be too much to expect the writer to know that his two monks were two secular canons, and that Harold's foundation at Waltham was not an abbey. Of William the Conqueror we learn that "he introduced the curfew-bell," and that he brought the feudal system to perfection in England—a statement which at once shows that the writer has no exact knowledge either of feudalism or of William's attitude towards it. Under "Language and Literature" the pupil is taught to believe in the forged history of "Ingulphus," and to take the romancer Geoffrey of Monmouth seriously as "another writer of English history." The philosophy of clothes doubtless has its importance, but still it seems hardly necessary for an instructor of youth solemnly to bid his pupil "Describe the shoes of young men of fashion," and "State what you know regarding the dresses of the Norman ladies." In a book published at Glasgow we must not expect to have the relations of Scotland to England fairly set forth, nor be surprised at finding Richard Cœur-de-Lion's surrender of the special conditions imposed by his father on the Scottish King improved into a complete surrender of the English claim of superiority, "so that Scotland again became independent." But we should have thought that by this time every one had taken in the fact that the English Crown in early days was partially elective, and that such teaching as the following was out of date:—"Robert, being the eldest son of the Conqueror, should have succeeded to the throne." "Arthur . . . was the rightful heir to the throne." Constitutional history, however, is not the writer's strong point. For him and his pupils the history of the great reign of Edward I. is made up solely of that King's dealings with Wales and Scotland, and of a few disjointed "General Facts":—"During this reign

windmills, spectacles, and looking-glasses, were introduced," &c. Of the development of the Parliamentary system, or of the Parliament of 1295 and the Confirmation of the Charters—two of the most important landmarks of our history—there is not a word. So under Edward III. there is no word of the Statute of Treasons or of the Good Parliament. Further on, the book becomes rather better, and may be fairly described as nothing much worse than commonplace and twaddling, especially on the subjects of the Great Exhibition and the Prince Consort. The statement that the Marriage Act of 1836 "permitted Dissenters in England to marry at other places than the Established Church" sounds as if the author took the Established Church to be a material fabric; and it is clear from the section on "The British Constitution" that he believes the King to be one of the Three Estates; but this is only what is to be expected in one who has not studied the constitutional history of the reign of Edward I. We will conclude with giving the author's opinion of his own work. It will, he believes, "be found quite sufficient to ensure a Pass in History, whether in connexion with the Government, University, or Civil Service Examinations." If this be so, we can only say that it is an odd sort of history that passes.

We have left ourselves scanty space in which to notice the *Handbook of English Political History*, by Messrs. Acland and Ransome. This is a very different style of book from that which we have last noticed, and we almost owe it an apology for placing it in such company. It does not profess to give more than outlines and summaries of facts, and its authors claim originality for the method of arrangement alone. "The facts," they observe, "are the common property of all who read or write about history," though they add that they have taken care to verify these facts, and have exercised an independent judgment in the many cases where historians disagree. Part I. of the work contains a continuous outline of events arranged in chronological order on the right-hand pages. Against these, on the left, are placed foreign and colonial events, with genealogies, notes, and quotations, as well as blank spaces in which the reader may add notes of his own. The second part consists of summaries, such as "Parliament," "Scotland," "Army," "Gradual Union of England into one Kingdom," and so forth. Of a book of this kind, dealing with so enormous a mass of facts, often of a dry and technical kind, it is of course impossible to judge till after long study and use; but, on glancing over it, we have been much struck with the fulness and precision of its information, more especially on tough subjects such as taxation and ecclesiastical history, and with the scholarly and accurate way in which it is executed. The method of arrangement appears to us to be excellent, whether we refer to it as a book of Annals, in which it may compare with that admirable though somewhat partisan work, the *Annals of England*, or for summaries of special periods. Every student will appreciate the advantage of having intelligently made and easily accessible summaries on, say, the history of Parliamentary taxation, from "Danegeld paid by the advice of the Witan for the first time" in 991, to the Bill of Rights; or of the history of Scotland, including its relations to the English Crown, which are here fairly and accurately stated; or of the movement for "Catholic Relief"; or of the rise and fall of the Corn Laws. Altogether, it is long since we have seen a book so likely to be a real assistance to the student as well as to the teacher.

YONGE ON OLIVER GOLDSMITH.*

WE have a right to expect that he who undertakes to edit a selection from the Essays of Oliver Goldsmith should at all events have that general acquaintance with English literature which is possessed by any well-read man. If we go a step further, and ask that he should be able to write in a style that will at least escape unfavourable notice, we do not know that our requirements would be excessive. Mr. Yonge unfortunately satisfies us in neither of these points. His ignorance is at times astounding, while the manner in which he strings his clauses together is in the highest degree awkward. To make the matter worse, he blunders through mere carelessness, and falls into mistakes which, with all his ignorance, he might easily have avoided. What are the qualifications which in these days of Abridgments and Selections are thought necessary in an editor we are at a loss to guess. That he should have a sound knowledge of his subject as a whole, and a minute knowledge of his author in particular, is the last thing that seems to be asked. *Docendo discimus* would seem to be the motto of these gentlemen; but then their teaching is so bad that their learning does little more than widen the bounds of their ignorance. How wide are these bounds in Mr. Yonge's case we will now show, though we fear that our readers may almost refuse to believe that a man who has been a Professor in University, and who has written many books, can have fallen into blunders so gross. In an Introduction of thirty-three pages he gives a sketch of Goldsmith's life. For this, by the way, he has gone to Prior. Why he should have passed over Forster we are at a loss to guess; unless, indeed, his studies in literature have not as yet made him acquainted with

that author's writings. He thus describes the proposal that was once made to Goldsmith that he should write in support of the Ministry:—

At one time, we do not know the precise occasion, Mr. Basil Montague, a man well known in the political, literary, and fashionable world, was sent to him by the Government of the day, "to offer him *carte blanche* if he would write in support of the administration." To Mr. Montague's astonishment, and, indeed, indignation, he rejected the proposal, though accompanied with an offer of the most liberal payment. As Mr. Montague described his answer, "He was so absurd as to say, I can earn as much as will supply my wants without writing for any party; the assistance therefore you offer is unnecessary to me." We may differ from Mr. Montague, and think that a man who, though living "in a miserable set of chambers in the Temple," could thus decline offers which must bind him to defend measures which in his heart, perhaps, he did not approve, but his support of which was to be munificently rewarded, displayed not "absurdity," but an independence of spirit which can hardly be too much admired.

It is difficult to fathom the depths of the ignorance of a writer who believes that Basil Montagu could have been sent by any one but his mother or his nurse to Oliver Goldsmith. It is perhaps still more difficult to imagine the audacity—we might say the impudence—of an editor who, knowing nothing of Basil Montagu, assures his readers that he was "a man well known in the political, literary, and fashionable world." Mr. Yonge quotes Macaulay more than once. Has he never read Macaulay's review of Basil Montagu's edition of Bacon? It may be too much to expect that he should have dipped into either the *Reminiscences* or the *Life of Carlyle*. But from the reviews of these two books he might have gathered that Carlyle had known Basil Montagu somewhat intimately. It is useless to go further, and to show how many are the writers through whom we get a knowledge of Basil Montagu. In a letter of his that is published in the *Life of Sir James Mackintosh* he describes how he was "cradled in aristocracy, yet devoted from childhood to the acquisition of knowledge." At the date of Goldsmith's death he was scarcely out of his aristocratic cradle; at all events he was not breeched, as Mr. Yonge may find if he will turn to any *cyclopaedia* of biography. Our readers may well wonder how our editor has fallen into this monstrous blunder. He has merely made a confusion between an old parson and a young lawyer. It was the Earl of Sandwich who had tried to hire Goldsmith; as his go-between he had employed his own chaplain. Basil Montagu, as is well known, was the Earl's illegitimate son by the unfortunate Miss Ray, whose murder is described by Boswell. It was from his father's chaplain that he had learnt the story.

Scarcely less astonishing is the confusion into which Mr. Yonge falls as regards the first and the third Earls of Shaftesbury. In a long note he criticizes Goldsmith's statement that the Augustan Age in England must be placed in "the reign of Queen Anne or some years before that period." As one of the proofs that the age of the Restoration rather deserves this title he instances, among other authors, Shaftesbury. His name he had learnt, we hazard a guess, from Goldsmith himself, who compares "the philosophic manner of Lord Shaftesbury's writing" with that of Cicero. Mr. Yonge, in a note on this, says, "Shaftesbury. The Ashley of the Cabal Ministry; the Ahiotophel of Dryden's great Satire." We do not know wherein Mr. Yonge is more unfortunate—in making a child in petticoats the go-between of a corrupt statesman and a famous writer, or in describing a boy of ten as the object of the lines

Else, why should he, with wealth and honour blest,
Refuse his age the needful hours of rest?

But behind all these there is a worse error than ever. In this same note our editor places "Milton as to his earlier works" in the age of Elizabeth. He cannot plead that the Elizabethan age might properly be thus extended by more than thirty years; for so strictly does he draw the line as against Goldsmith, that he excludes from the writers of the age of Queen Anne, not only Shaftesbury, but Locke, Halifax, and even Burnet.

We are but little surprised that he buries Goldsmith, not only in Westminster Abbey, but in Poets' Corner. It is true that his grave is in the Temple churchyard, and that the exact spot where he lies there is unknown. Mr. Yonge has Mr. Trevelyan as an authority, if he needs one, who in the last paragraph of his *Life of Lord Macaulay* places Goldsmith's tomb in the Abbey. He makes a worse blunder when he states that his hero was only forty-three years old at the time of his death. If his authority is Goldsmith's epitaph, he is still wrong; for, according to it, he was but forty-two. The epitaph, however, is in error, as Mr. Yonge ought to know. Indeed he himself states, and states correctly, that Goldsmith was born in 1728, and died in 1774. In writing of *She Stoops to Conquer* he says:—"Indeed, next to the masterpieces of Sheridan, it will probably be very generally admitted to have been the best comedy produced in the last hundred years." This sentence, we imagine, has been transferred from Prior's Life. When it was written, it was correct, at all events so far as the dates are concerned. But, as not only *She Stoops to Conquer*, but also *The Rivals*, *The School for Scandal*, and *The Critic* were produced more than a hundred years ago, it now makes an addition to our editor's list of errors. A few pages earlier he writes:—

In the autumn of 1751 a publisher named Wilde projected a periodical called "The Bee," to consist entirely of essays, and of those all that have survived were the work of Goldsmith.

Our readers, by the way, will notice in this sentence Mr. Yonge's peculiar mode of linking two statements which have nothing to do with each other by the use of the word *and*. It

* *Essays of Oliver Goldsmith, M.D.* Selected and Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. D. Yonge, M.A., Author of "The History of the British Navy"; "The Life of Marie Antoinette"; "A Constitutional History of Great Britain and Ireland from 1760-1860," &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1882.

would be easy to bring forward numerous instances of this were it worth the while. But our present business is to point out two errors into which he has fallen in these three lines. The year was 1759, and not 1751, and the publisher's name was Wilkie, and not Wilde. So careless, indeed, is he in his figures, that in his notes on the first essay four of his references to the pages of his own book are wrong. His quotations, moreover, are not always to be trusted. Thus he says that Johnson entitled Goldsmith's *History of Rome* "a plain narrative, telling the reader shortly all he could want to know; and written in a style that would bear frequent re-perusal." What Johnson did say was as follows:—"Goldsmith tells you shortly all you want to know . . . his plain narrative will please again and again." We are willing to acquit Mr. Yonge of improving Johnson's words. He trusted, we are ready to believe, to Prior, and Prior misled him. On the same shoulders, perhaps, must be laid two errors in his quotation of the famous passage in which Johnson closes his Life of Addison. Who, however, is responsible for Mr. Yonge's statement that Bolingbroke's reputation as a writer soon passed away we shall not hazard a guess. Bolingbroke may long have ceased to be commonly read; but an author's popularity is one thing, his reputation is quite another. A man who has permanently moulded the popular style of writing cannot easily lose his reputation. Neither can we agree with our editor when he asserts that Pope's "sneer or satire" against Colley Cibber "was wholly undeserved." It is, no doubt, true that Cibber wrote at least one comedy of unusual excellence; but, on the other hand, his birthday odes, though he spared no pains on them, would have disgraced even the poet-laureate of the *Rejected Addresses*. Let Mr. Yonge get an old copy of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and read but a few of great Cibber's lines to Great George, and he will, we are sure, wish his note unwritten.

In the introduction Mr. Yonge gives "a few general observations on the history and character of English essay-writing." What he says of the *Rambler* and the *Idler* is another proof, if another proof were needed, that he is ready enough to write on subjects of which he knows nothing:—

Though his [Johnson's] reputation as a great thinker and talker created a fair demand for them at the time, they have long ceased to attract notice, and are known only to the curious. In truth his magniloquent and cumbrous fashion of speaking and writing, on no subject very well adapted to attract the generality of readers, was especially unsuitable for that lighter class of literature, which if it cannot be read with ease is not likely to be read at all. Still, as they sold for a time, they stimulated imitation, and in the "Life of Johnson" we see occasional mention of the "Adventurer," the "Connoisseur," and the "World."

It is an absurd statement that a demand for the *Rambler* was created by Johnson's reputation as a great thinker and talker. In the first place, what general reputation either as one or the other had he in the year 1750? In the next place, it was not known for a while who was the Rambler. In fact, his name was intentionally kept a secret. Even Richardson did not learn that it was Johnson till forty-five numbers had appeared. The sale, as it was issued in numbers, was but small; but in its collected form it became very popular. As we learn from Boswell, "its author lived to see ten numerous editions of it in London, besides those of Ireland and Scotland." It is ridiculous, therefore, for Mr. Yonge to assert "that, as they sold for a time, they stimulated imitation." To make his error still worse, all the three papers which he instances were earlier than the *Idler*, of which, as well as of the *Rambler*, he maintains they were imitations. It is news to us to learn that Johnson's fashion of speaking was magniloquent and cumbrous. There is a certain tautology, by the way, in magniloquent speaking. Be that as it may, it is not easy to understand how readers can be attracted by speaking, whether magniloquent or not. We shall not here stop to maintain that on some subjects his style was very well adapted to attract the generality of readers. We shall be content with quoting Lord Macaulay on this subject, who says of the *Lives of Poets* that "the narratives are as entertaining as any novel." But we may with good reason ask Mr. Yonge whether he has even so much as glanced at a single *Rambler*. If he has, we are astonished at his asserting that it belongs to the lighter class of literature, and that it stimulated the imitation of so frivolous, and even licentious, a publication as the *World*. We are reminded of the dull man who tried to read Harris's *Hermes*, and mistook that learned work on grammar for a novel. When he was asked what he thought of it, he replied:—"Why, to speak the truth, I was not much diverted; I think all these imitations of *Tristram Shandy* fall far short of the original."

It is time to bring our observations on Mr. Yonge and his editing to an end, though not a little remains that we should like to say. Nevertheless, we must find space for two short quotations. "Shenstone," he writes, "had died in 1763, at the age of forty-eight, but his poetry is of a very inferior class." It would seem to be the case that for a poet to die either in 1763, or at the age of forty-eight, should lead us to expect that his poetry was of a high order. Let us hope that some day Mr. Yonge may edit himself, and then, perhaps, he will explain his use of the conjunctions. Three pages further on in his notes we read:—

"Facilis descensus." Virgil adds Averni (*Aen.* vi. 126), which Dryden translates in a phrase strikingly adapted to the warning Goldsmith means to inculcate:—

"The gates of hell are open night and day."

Does Mr. Yonge really think that Dryden's line is a translation of *Facilis descensus Averni?* Has he forgotten *Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis?*

A HISTORY OF SHORTHAND.*

THE origin and first invention of this craft are wrapped in clouds, and have been as much discussed by professors and enthusiasts of the art as the first beginnings of Freemasonry. The "learned Funcius," as we are informed by the "learned" author of the work before us, ascribed the discovery of shorthand to Adam himself, who hit upon it, probably, in much the same way as Solomon hit upon the apron and the compass. Funcius, however, does not appear to have explained why the first man did not, once and for all, invent a system which should meet the real difficulties of the case, become a complete substitute for "long-hand"—which, indeed, he need not in that case have invented at all—and be as legible as print. Baruch, the son of Neriah, is confidently referred to by enthusiasts as the Prophet Jeremiah's shorthand reporter; and if there should be still any doubt about the antiquity of the art, we may look up, we are told, that passage in the Book of Esdras—although an apocryphal book, it is undoubtedly ancient—in which five excellent stenographers, "ready to write swiftly," are mentioned by name. It is also asserted, on the authority of Diogenes Laertius, that Xenophon took down the remarks of Socrates in shorthand.

Mr. Anderson, however, belongs to the cold and critical, or rationalistic, school of stenographers; he considers that the earliest system of shorthand, disregarding mere abbreviations, was the Roman. He seems to have arrived at this opinion by a study of the illustrious Kopp, a German author who succeeded in reconstructing the Roman system called *Note Notariorum*, or *Note Tyroniane*. Of this great man Mr. Anderson speaks with reverential awe. His book is an "ocean of palaeographic lustre." This is praise indeed. In the third volume there is a portrait of the author; "as we gaze upon it we are struck by a certain resemblance in it to the picture sometimes given of Niebuhr. . . . The light of perspicuity shines in his serene eye, his face is one of singular sweetness and placidity, and his breast is adorned with the orders of the Brandenburg Red Eagle, the Zähringen Löwen, and the Golden Lion of Hesse." Could any description convey a more majestic idea of this great man? Kopp's restoration shows a regular alphabet, in which many of the letters are simply Phoenician characters; for instance, the *h*, *l*, *m*, and *p*. But these letters, with small alterations and additions, were used as abbreviations for words in common use. Thus the letter *a* without change stood for *alius*, and with the addition of a dot for *aliens*; with another trifling change it stood, we are told, for *avium* (why the genitive plural, where the others are all in the nominative singular?); and with another for *attonus*. Mr. Anderson—perhaps from Kopp, perhaps "out of his own head"—thus sums up the merits of the Roman system:—

The alphabet of it was formed on a close imitation of the vulgar or Cadmean alphabet; it was based not on the sonantal, but on the orthographical principle; it abounded in the use of initials, following in this respect the abbreviating formula in common use with the Romans; and, principal distinction of all, it was marked by this peculiar excellence which rendered and renders it superior to every other system known till to-day, anterior, cotemporary or subsequent, this, namely, that by it, one and the same consonant letter, without the addition of points or any other signs whatsoever, expressed, by the inclination of such letter in three different directions the exact vowel, *a*, *e*, or *i*, which followed.

The Greek system, on the other hand, did not, according to Mr. Anderson, still following his Kopp of the three orders, precede the Roman, but followed it, and was not invented until the second or third century. Contrary, therefore, to the usual practice, which is for inventions to appear at the time when they are wanted, and not when they are no longer of use, the Greeks first found out shorthand when there was nothing more worth taking down. This opinion has not been, however, accepted unanimously, and there has been quite a controversy over it, with such an array of stenographic talent on both sides that an outsider dares not venture to have an opinion. It seems, however, that the Greek and the Roman systems are totally unlike each other; so that the Romans, at all events, did not borrow their system, but invented it. On the other hand, many of the characters are the same. There can be no doubt that the practice of shorthand writing was not only common among the Romans, but also official. It was a recognized instrument in the service of the State; the shorthand scribe sat in all the courts of law, and recorded the proceedings of the Roman Senate; there were schools of shorthand, and professors; the Imperial stenographers at Constantinople had official rank assigned to them; professorial *notarii* accompanied orators and preachers. Augustine, for instance, employed no fewer than sixteen; while Pliny the Elder was contented with one. There were perils as well as prizes connected with the calling. One unfortunate scribe had the finger nerves cut, so that he should misreport no more; another, who at the trial of a Christian so far forgot what was due to the dignity of a court that he threw his tablets at the magistrate's head, was made to join that Christian in his martyrdom; another, named "Jovien"—probably Mr. Anderson means Jovian—met with a remarkable, though very disagreeable, fate:—

His military valour won for him an obsidional crown, but—*primus inter notarios onnes*—he was by the succeeding monarch precipitated into a pit and buried beneath a mound of stones, for no stronger reasons, apparently, than that he had the misfortune to bear the same name as his

* *History of Shorthand; with a Review of its Present Condition and Prospects in Europe and America.* By Thomas Anderson, Parliamentary Reporter, Fellow of the Shorthand Society, and formerly Shorthand Writer in the Glasgow Law Courts. London: Allen & Co. 1882.

imperial master, and that he had been nominated by some of the soldiers as the successor of Julian.

Mr. Anderson does not give us the authority for this story. As, however, he spells nearly all his names after the French fashion, it is to be presumed that, with other learned anecdotes in the book, this is borrowed from M. Guénin's *Recherches sur l'histoire de la Sténographie*. Thus there was a certain irascible Pope about whom Mr. Anderson tells a queer story. His shorthand writer one day fell asleep, whereupon the Pontiff gave him so mighty a box on the ear, that the unlucky officer fell dead, and the Pope had "to fly to escape a trial for murder and the abuse, and curses of the people." A most imposing footnote refers the reader for proof of this fact to "Anastasii S.R.E. Bibliothecarii Historia de Vitis Romanorum Pontificum," published in Paris in the year 1649. Are we to understand that Mr. Anderson himself consulted this work, or that he found the anecdote quoted in Guénin? There certainly was a Pope Vigilius in the sixth century who had a stormy time with heretics. Continual argument may have "gone to his head" and destroyed his original meekness; but, on looking at Anastasius in Muratori's Collection, we find that the charge was merely a "suggestio"—a false charge made by the Pope's enemies—and that there was no running away at all.

The "Tyronian" art gradually fell out of use, and for six centuries there was no systematized shorthand, though the art in some form was not altogether forgotten. Probably the plan generally followed by the swift writer was to leave out articles, inflexions, case-endings, plurals, and so forth, and to make large use of abbreviations. We are not told, unfortunately, the method followed by those angels whom St. Bernard was privileged to see taking down "on notarial schedules" every word the monks were singing in church, nor, indeed, is it apparent why they took down words which must have been already perfectly familiar to them. In the middle of the twelfth century, the monk, John of Tilbury, invented a *nova notaria*, which was based upon the perpendicular stroke varied in form by the addition of cross and diagonal dashes at the top, the centre, and the bottom, the vowels being represented by dots. A system invented in India last year by a certain Babu Chandra Rai curiously resembles that of John of Tilbury. In some form or other shorthand had begun again to be extensively practised at the time of the Reformation, or, to use the beautiful language of Mr. Anderson, in "the earlier part of this period we have shorthand again playing an important part in the affairs of the Church, and rescuing from oblivion the extemporeaneous effusion of ideal potentes like Savonarola and Luther."

The modern history of shorthand begins with the seventeenth century. Many things have been done for mankind since the year 1600, but never, in the opinion of Mr. Anderson, anything more remarkable than the new shorthand. "So far," he says, "the chief characteristics of this period are the birth of modern shorthand in England, and the rise and unrivalled propagation of the German *Redezeichenkunst*, or art of speech signs." The earnestness and sincerity of the inventors of the various systems have been proved, Mr. Anderson thinks, in a remarkable, almost in a unique manner—namely, by this fact, that the books in which these systems are set forth were dedicated to kings and great men. This, though we never thought of it before, is the reason why the verses of certain neglected poets and the sermons of certain forgotten divines of the last century must be in reality so excellent. We need not follow our author in the technical treatment of the growth of the science. We must, however, pause to call attention once more to the singular beauty of his language. There are two schools of systems, one based on spelling, the other on sound. Mr. Anderson likens these schools to "two opposite currents, each of them gathering strength in their onward course, and both of them accomplishing results of no mean value in circles constantly widening." How a current can be a circle, widening in its onward course, may be explained by the following passage, which states that "this was only reached by 'eliminating' arbitrary combinations, 'exorcising' thin and and thick strokes, and 'evicting' pictorial signs." The systems now in principal use in England are Pitman's, Taylor's, and Gurney's. Their relative merits do not seem quite fairly set forth by Mr. Anderson. However, it is difficult to be quite impartial, and we are glad to find that, while one critic is quoted who calls Pitman's system "an absurd assemblage of strokes in outline," another speaks of it as "an excellent system when acquired." As regards the value of shorthand, it seems at this time of day absurd to discuss the question. And as to the obvious objection that very few who begin the study carry it on, the reply is equally obvious that no one pretends that shorthand is easy; that all successful shorthand writers have been men of intelligence and dexterity; that great patience and perseverance are required to learn the art; and that great practice is wanted to make the writer ready. Finally, it must be conceded, on the evidence of all who have considered the subject, that there is no system in existence which does not present many objections.

In order to make this work the complete "brachygraphical study" which the author desires it to be, the systems in use in other countries are briefly described. In France there appears to be as many rival systems as in England. A portrait is given of M. Hippolyte Prévost, from which it would seem that Mr. Anderson awards him the principal place among the French candidates for favour. In Germany, on the other hand, a system invented by a Bavarian named Gabelsberger has Mr. Anderson's approval, and appears to be devouring all other methods. It

claims to possess the great advantage of being really adequate to the requirements of rapid writing. The Government in Germany has organized its public teaching, and one result is that in every profession there are thousands who can practise a useful art, a knowledge of which in this country is mostly limited to reporters. In the German States there were, in 1874, 16,449 pupils in stenography, receiving lessons at 608 establishments, and from 779 teachers. The system of Gabelsberger is followed everywhere except in the Prussian Chamber. It is rather remarkable that in America no system of shorthand has been invented. As regards the literature of the subject, it is far more voluminous than an outsider would have suspected. Hundreds of systems have been proposed, most of them closely resembling each other; indeed it is not possible to have great divergence in the manufacture of small easily written characters; and most of the books on the subject are simply proposals for a new method. But not all; there is, in addition to them, a whole literature of controversy and of history. The book before us, for example, has the merit of giving so much of the history as could be got from Kopp and Guénin. It gives, as may be guessed, a good deal more which has not so much merit. It would have been more useful, for instance, if some friend had gone through the proofs, taken out the opening chapter in which the author discusses—with such previous training and knowledge as may be guessed—the invention of writing, the origin of language, and the "next step" of the savage. The science of language is thus summed up:—"The established course of things is—first, crudity; next, improvement; at length, perfection; and, finally, that celestial repose or transformation which is sometimes misnamed decay and sometimes death." It would be difficult to compress more scientifically the laws of linguistic development. It would have been well, too, had Mr. Anderson got some one to look after his Latin, and his history. What treatise, for instance, is that called *De Morti Claudi Casoris?* And the following passage is obscure:—"In omnia artes sunt primae et sunt secunda ut in pueribus literis; puma est abecudaria." Where, again, is Mr. Anderson's authority for the statement that "Titus, like Diocletian," was the son of a shorthand writer? Can it be the learned Kopp, or the romantic Guénin? He must have read it, or fancied that he read it, somewhere. It is probable that the literary art of which Mr. Anderson speaks at the outset with so much admiration has been of necessity admired by him at a distance. "Brachygraphical" studies are absorbing; and, when one is worshipping a Kopp with three orders, one forgets to look after such little matters as literary style and accuracy. But Mr. Anderson is clearly a very great scholar, as is shown by his profound acquaintance with ancient literature, as well as by his disregard of Latin grammar. Who but a ripe scholar could quote in the same chapter at once "the polished elegiacs of the medievalist," Nicols, Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, Dr. Mavor, Leland the antiquary, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Brébeuf, Canon Farrar, the "learned Funcius," Goethe, Manilius, Livy, Suetonius, Seneca, Plutarch, and Sallust? As for the little trifles of which we have spoken, they are perhaps due to the freehand carelessness, the exuberance of scholarship a little over ripe.

A PRODIGAL'S PROGRESS.

MMR. BARRETT is a clever novelist, but he does not make the most of his cleverness. In a production like the modern novel, which is intended simply to be read currently and enjoyed, it is of the greatest importance that there should be no glaring error or failing off in any part. The three or four most popular of living novelists—they may be named as the reader likes—are specially noticeable for the evenness of their work, and the fact that the reader is never "brought up all standing" by them. Now Mr. Barrett has not succeeded yet in imparting this equable interest to his stories. He seriously injured his last, *Lieutenant Barnabas*, by neglecting verisimilitude in the third volume, and he has done much the same with this. Still *Lieutenant Barnabas* was better than most contemporary novels, and so is *A Prodigal's Progress*, if only because of the author's healthy and sturdy moral portraiture, because he has a charming heroine, and because he has an excellent command of fresh and lively dialogue. As was the case with *Lieutenant Barnabas*, the time of *A Prodigal's Progress* is thrown back for nearly a century, and another year's study of the period seems to have done good service in helping to free the author from certain inaccuracies and anachronisms of which he was guilty in his former book. He is not quite perfect in his "temporal colour," perhaps, even yet; but in his local colour—that of the marches of Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, and Devonshire—he is fairly expert.

The story of *A Prodigal's Progress* turns on the wickedness of a domestic chaplain of the Roman Catholic persuasion; and Mr. Barrett's portraiture of Father Dominick is indeed of a character to make the bones of Michelet and Charlotte Elizabeth turn in their graves for joy. He is an awful villain is this Father, as bad as his namesake in Dryden's *Spanish Friar*, and much less jovial. Having got command of the conscience of a boozy Protestant squire and baronet in the West country, Father Dominick has, at a period antecedent to the beginning of the story, begun to play the mischief with all and sundry persons connected with Sir

Gilbert Godwin. The Baronet's wife is the object of his lawless addresses; and, as she is found one night with a knife in her bosom and the priest near her, it is generally thought on the country side that she has been murdered by him in revenge for a refusal to listen to his suit. But this is only part of this terrible Father Dominick's guilt. Having relieved Sir Gilbert of his wife, he provides him with another, who has stood, and stands, in no dubious relation to himself, while a certain mysterious "Eugenius" who is just like Father Dominick, is brought up at Godwin's Moat as the son of Lady Godwin by a mythical first marriage. But there is a son and heir by Sir Godwin's first wife (supposed murdered) who is still in Father Dominick's way, and as the grandfather on the mother's side is living in the neighbourhood, and keeps a sharp look-out, direct foul play is difficult. Then, indeed, Father Dominick devises a fresh design, as the translators of Homer say. The boy having grown up, the Father selects for his tutor and governor a clergyman of the Church of England of the worst repute who has been driven from his living for misconduct, and sends him on the grand tour with this precious Mentor. As it happens, however, the Father overreaches himself. The Rev. Mr. Tickel, who plays a very important part in this book, is indeed emphatically what is called a loose fish; he exercises not the slightest control over Blase Godwin's disorderly desires, and as, in order to prevent popular scandal, it is not part of Father Dominick's plan to stint the heir of money, at first the young man gets through fifteen thousand pounds in about seven or eight years. The story opens when he has just entangled himself with play debts up to the limits of his last thousand, after which he has been warned that no more is to be expected. But Blase Godwin, if a prodigal, is no scoundrel, and his tutor, who has stuck to him half out of selfishness and half out of affection, is much more of a glutton and a ne'er-do-well than of a positive reprobate. The pair, not without some grumbling from the parson, who likes the fleshpots of London and is indisposed towards projects of reformation on the part of his patron, determine to leave the Circean town and seek the "domestic veal," as M. de Florac has it. Many things occur on the way in which Mr. Barrett's reading of Smollett and Fielding and his faculty of hearty natural writing come out very fairly. But though Blase is received with all decency at Godwin's Moat, the only terms offered him are board and lodging on condition of polite sufferance of his stepmother, Father Dominick, and the questionable Eugenius, and these his stomach cannot brook. He prefers the humbler but warmer welcome of his mother's father, Captain Davenant, a squire of small fortune, and of his daughter Gertrude, Blase's aunt. (Thackeray, if he had been sketching the plot of this book for his publisher, would have put AUNT in capital letters.) It is agreed that Blase shall try for a commission with his grandfather's remnants of interest, and with four hundred and fifty pounds which his AUNT produces quite unexpectedly. Meanwhile the invaluable Mr. Tickel unearths two "fortunes," an aunt and a niece, of whom he suggests that Blase should take the choice. The first volume closes with an episode which seems to show that Blase has really sown his wild oats, inasmuch as he resists very valiantly one of the strongest possible temptations to a young buck of his age at the end of the last century, and indeed to a young man at the beginning, end, and middle of most periods in the world's history.

The second volume thickens the interest, but, alas, has to tell of a relapse in Blase. He falls desperately in love with the younger of Parson Tickel's two discoveries, and courts her in London while he is waiting for his commission. But the commission is long a-coming (by the way, Mr. Barrett seems to ante-date Mrs. Clarke's iniquities here, if we do not mistake him), and Blase's habits are expensive, and the parson is not a good counsellor. How the prodigal falls once more among thieves, and how Father Dominick, by means of Eugenius, prepares a trap for him, into which having fallen he is to all appearance deprived at once of love and fortune, and how his beloved Lydia's courage and intelligence (stoutly seconded by the parson, who improves miraculously when tested) brings about a complete revolution of poetical justice, these things may be read in Mr. Barrett's pages. We shall not forestall them.

We are bound to say that the *dénouement* is one mass of improbabilities. That a schemer such as Father Dominick should have omitted to secure even one of the servants in many years of rule, so that when a trick of Lydia's shuts him up with his paramour and her son in a tower he is helpless, and the domestics all do the bidding of strangers—this is a rather strong demand on the reader's credulity. But the crowning device is more preposterous still. Blase's mother turns up; she has not been murdered, and Captain Davenant has known it all the time. So that we are asked to believe that for a considerable number of years he has allowed his daughter to be kept out of her rights, his grandson to be endangered in life, fortune, and morals, a stranger to rule bigamously, and, in all seeming, adulterously, in his son-in-law's house, and the author of all these harms to triumph and plot evil, when he could have smashed Father Dominick at any moment he chose. This, we fear, will not quite do.

However, despite these grave and almost fatal faults of construction, there is a great deal of merit in the book. Lydia Liston, the heroine, and Parson Tickel are both figures which do Mr. Barrett a great deal of credit. Blase is not remarkable, except as a healthy Tom Jones, with a rather finer sense of the becoming. Father Dominick is simply the stock Jesuit fiend, and Eugenius the stock Jesuit pupil. But Lydia and Tickel are, let it be re-

peated, good. The former, though evidently not without her debts to Fielding's charming heroines, is sufficiently original. She has more character than they have, as well as more feeling for Shakespeare and the musical glasses. Since she must have been about the same age as (if not rather younger than) Jane Austen, she is perhaps unduly antique in character; indeed the whole book strikes one as toned rather for the middle than for the end of the eighteenth century. But she is very delightful for all that; and her determination at once not to forgive Blase directly when she finds out that his design on her was partly mercenary, and at the same time to recover his own fortune for him by the boldest of strokes, is a delightful illustration in the innocent kind of the old theme "comment l'esprit vient aux filles." As for Parson Tickel, he is good throughout. Everybody will naturally compare him with Thackeray's Sampson, and, to come to a nearer rival, with Mr. Besant's "Chaplain of the Fleet." But he is quite able to hold his own individuality. He is of a lower social and intellectual grade than Thackeray's pleasant sinner; he has none of the commanding virtues or vices of Messrs. Besant and Rice's burly divine. He is simply a good-natured selfish parasite of the eighteenth-century type, with an entire want of self-esteem or of consciousness of the duties of his profession, but having a canine fidelity and something like a canine shrewdness, and capable of being roused in certain circumstances out of his sloth and sensuality and parasitic dependence. Mr. Barrett, not without art, shows him at his worst at the beginning, and by no means succumbs to the temptation of making him an entirely reformed character at the end. Indeed the parson in the last scene of all cajoles Lydia's aunt, whom on occasion he has grossly and very amusingly insulted, into matrimony in the most impudent way in the world. It is also too true that he is mainly responsible for Blase's relapse into debt and his consequent troubles. But he is a very genial personage, if a rather contemptible one, and he comes out nobly in Lydia's bold stroke for a husband. Among his minor scenes, which are numerous and nearly all good, not the least is one in which he whose master and lord is certainly "Messer Gaster" sits down, expecting a copious dinner, to Captain Davenant's frugal family supper of toasted cheese and cider. The analytic nose may in these days be turned up at simple humour of this kind; but more authorities than one are of opinion that it is time to have recourse to it. It is certainly unfortunate that Mr. Barrett, who has a good deal of this humour as well as a remarkable faculty of dialogue, should not succeed in making his books a little better than he has yet actually made them. *Folly Morrison*, *Lieutenant Barnabas*, and this present *Prodigal's Progress*, are all books above the average in actual interest and in the merit of parts; but they all have some grave drawback. The drawback here is the less excusable that the very slightest exercise of self-critical ingenuity, without altering the better part of the story at all, would have sufficed to get rid of its improbabilities and to make it a reasonable fiction.

THE ANTIQUARY.*

IN an account of Samuel Butler's unpublished remains, presented in this volume by Mr. H. B. Wheatley, we find the devotee of the past delineated as

An antiquated ghost that haunts
The charnel houses of the antients.

He is, moreover, said to have no "business for the intellect"; "to transcribe and copy and collect" being the whole of his poor employment, and all that is needed to fulfil his character; except, indeed, that he has a

prejudice to all that's new,
Though e'er so useful, rational, and true.

In protest against so humble an estimate of the archaeological mind the present collection of papers might be offered. Like other sciences, antiquarianism has advanced since Butler's day, and much more is meant by it than the ransacking of sepulchres or the mere miserly gathering together of dry fossils and drier facts. Instead of a funeral vault of urns, lamps, and lachrymatories, or of mouldering coffins and ruined skeletons, the traveller into olden time finds rather a sleeping palace, like that which, after a hundred years of suspended life, started again into animation at the coming of the fated fairy prince, who breaks the spell which bound the king and his barons at their wine, and the princess beneath her silk star-broider'd coverlet. The true antiquary, indeed, finds the past to be a living personality that teaches great lessons in its primitive monuments, mediæval castles, and ruined monasteries, whose former life, with their makings of human history, again lives before his eyes. Butler needed only to turn to his contemporary Sir Thomas Browne's *Hydriotaphia* to see what rich poetry, solemn philosophy, and consolatory religion might be drawn even from the urns and ashes of the cemetery. He might have been counselled in that work that "it is opportune to look back upon old times, and contemplate our forefathers. Great examples grow thin, and to be fetched from the past world. We have enough to do to make up ourselves from present and past times, and the whole stage of things scarce serveth for our instruction." It is superfluous, however, to apologize for antiquarian study. Archaeology has

* *The Antiquary: a Magazine devoted to the Study of the Past.* Vol. IV. London: Eliot Stock.

outlived ridicule, and become fashionable. The regret is that it was not fashionable, ages ago; for there would then have been spared to us many a noble building, such as Shaftesbury or Glastonbury, which had been part of the magnificence of England. We have not yet passed the days of wilful destruction; and, till that time arrives, there will be use for such publications as the one before us, which, among other things, teaches reverence for the genius of our forefathers.

We are hardly disposed to object to the fact that the *Antiquary* embraces within its scope not only the consideration of the persons and material remains, but also of the literature, of the past. Besides two readable papers on "Butler's Unpublished Remains," to which we have before adverted, there are several articles on the inevitable subject of Shakspeare; his "Deer Adventure"; his "Autobiography in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*"; the question whether he was an angler; on the spelling of his name; on his connexion with Gloucestershire; and on the Stratford of his day. These are, for the most part, searching inquiries in their special ways, though the reasoning may not always carry conviction to the reader's mind. Although the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe has industriously gathered from the poet's writings every mention of fishes and fishing, many of the allusions are so slight as hardly to strengthen his argument that Shakspeare was a zealous fisher in the Avon and its tributary streams. Cæsar's character of Anthony, that "He fishes, drinks, and wastes the night in revel," is one of these passages; and that "Nero is an angler in the lake of darkness" is another; while Lady Capulet's assertion that "the fish lives in the sea" hardly helps the case. A like mode of citation might be used to establish that Homer was a great lion-hunter, for the Iliad alone contains as many as four-and-twenty illustrations drawn from lions and lion-hunting, each of a more minute and detailed character than any of Shakspeare's references to fishes and fishing. But many slight threads may make a strong cord; and Mr. Ellacombe not inaptly contends, no doubt from his own feelings as an angler, that the poet's frequent touches on the contemplative man's recreation must have followed from the delight of the diversion being always present to his feelings. However this may have been, the study of the papers on the question whether Shakspeare was an angler is as pleasant as to rest idly among the sedge and flowers to watch the "fish cut with her golden oars the silver stream"; and the brother of the sport who does not carry away from their perusal some enduring recollection of the quotations and allusions he has met with deserves to lose his largest trout.

After examining the late Mr. William Henty's fervid vindication of Shakspeare from the charge of wholesale deer-stealing, we are inclined to exclaim with Mr. Toots, "It's of no consequence." The writer limits the poet's share in the destruction of deer to the killing of one buck, which act, moreover, took place, not in the enclosure of Charlote, but on the adjoining estate of Fulbrook, which was then in the hands of the Crown, though a nominal appanage of the Lucy's. To chase the deer, with or without hound and horn, was in Elizabeth's day rather a gallant offence than an immoral deed, so long as there was no trespassing on private grounds and the pursuer was not caught. As Shakspeare, after all, did not gain possession of the buck that he killed, the question may fairly be considered too unimportant for further discussion, and it may be hoped that Mr. Henty's paper will prove the last on the subject.

In this age of reprints of old authors it is singular that so much writing of the author of *Hudibras* is still unpublished. Thyer's edition of Butler's *Remains* (A.D. 1759) includes, we are reminded by Mr. Wheatley, one hundred and twenty characters, beginning with an "Affected Man," and ending with a "Zealot." Sixty-one characters are yet unprinted, except in the specimens supplied in the *Antiquary*. Butler's essays, like those of the *Spectator*, mirror the social characteristics of the period, but in a rigid and icy style very different from the warm colouring and finish of Addison. Full of similitudes, and affected almost to euphemism, they are also in striking contrast with the superb pedantry and condensed eloquence of the *Religio Medici* and the *Christian Morals*. Browne searched the obscurities of man's spiritual conditions, and with like diligence Butler pried into the social and moral demeanour of those around him; but the persons were so individualized and accidental to his times that they are but very partially available as representatives of their class in our own day. From many of his characters which have inevitably become obsolete may be selected a "coffee man," who is described as keeping "a coffee market, where people of all qualities and conditions meet to trade in foreign drinks and newes, ale, smoak, and controversy. He admits of no distinction of persons, but gentlemen, mechanic, lord and scoundrel mix, and are all of a piece, as if they were resolved into their first principles." At the present day "an usurer" is called "a money-lender"; but the same definition will serve, for it may still be said that he "keeps his money in prison, and never lets it out except upon bail and good security, as Oliver Cromwell did the Cavaliers, to appear again upon warning."

There are biographical as well as historical parallels, and in illustration of the latter the case of Lady Elizabeth Hungerford, as related in this volume by Mr. W. J. Hardy, may be compared with the less authenticated story of Amy Robart. In the second volume of the *Antiquary*, the same writer drew attention to the tragic interest of Farley Hungerford Castle, near Bath, the (so said) haunted ruins of which might have formed the scene of a

romance mysterious enough for Mrs. Radcliff. Within the walls of the fortress, Agnes Cotell, afterwards Lady Hungerford, caused, in 1518, her first husband to be strangled and his body consumed to ashes in the kitchen furnace, which stood against the north-western tower. Her motive had been to free herself to marry the lord of the castle, which she was successful in doing, and she lived with him until his death five years later. She did not long survive him, inasmuch as a few months after his decease her guilt was proved, and, in John Stow's words, "she was led from the Tower of London to Holborne, and there put into a cart with one of her servants, and so carried to Tyburne and there hanged." Walter Lord Hungerford, of Heytesbury, only son of Lady Agnes's second husband by his first wife, also expiated his crimes on the scaffold. He had been three times married, and, though characteristically cruel to each wife in succession, the last of these ladies seems to have proved the favourite victim of his inhumanity. In a petition to Thomas Cromwell (in company with whom Lord Hungerford afterwards suffered on Tower Hill) she tells her pitiful story. She describes herself to have been a long prisoner in

my Lord's castle of Hungerford [where, she says] no creature is suffered, nor dare come unto me at any time, what need soever I have, or shall happen unto me, for my Lord's displeasure, but only such as are by him appointed at this time, which have not only heretofore sought all the means they might to rid me in secret out of my life, but yet daily doth, as it is not unknown to all this country, if it shall please your good lordship to inquire of any gentleman, or yeoman, dwelling about my Lord. I will except none.

That Lord Walter should defame his wife's character and defend his treatment of her, by giving out that she had been guilty of the worst form of unfaithfulness, was in keeping with his malignity; but it was an accusation of which she took God to record she was innocent, and one that probably no one believed more than did her accuser. She complained that she had been "these three or four years past, locked continually a prisoner in one of my lord's towers, without comfort of any creature, and under the custody of my Lord's chaplain, Sir John A' Lee, which hath once or twice heretofore poisoned me, as he will not deny upon examination." She was allowed no meat nor drink but such as was supplied her by this ill-minded priest or by the domestic fool; and, considering the murderous intention of Sir John A' Lee, who had promised his lord to be more effectual ere long in putting her out of the way, she reasonably dreaded to touch the food that was offered her. The extremities to which she was reduced are too abominable to be told except by the original document, but Mr. Hardy gives the unhappy lady's letter verbatim. There is a sweet touch of human nature in the circumstance that she was saved from perishing of hunger and thirst by the poor women of the country, who, she says, "brought me to my grated window in the night such meat and drink as they had, and gave me for the love of God, for money have I none wherewith to pay them, nor yet have had of my lord these four years four groats." She concludes her letter by asking a divorce from her oppressor, "or else," she adds, "require him to suffer me to come out of prison." She will then, she says, come "up afote" before the minister and plead her cause. "Let not his faire, craftie, and subtil tongue," she cautions—no doubt, as Mr. Hardy suggests, with a recollection of the day when she herself had been deluded by his suave discourse—"defraud your good lordship." Her petition appears to have been written about the year 1539, but its effect is not very apparent. As her husband, however, was executed for treason in 1541, she found freedom to make a happier match by becoming the wife of Sir Robert Throckmorton, with whom she lived many years, and to whom she bore several children.

In the accounts of "Melrose Abbey" and of "Woodspring Priory, Somersetshire," we feel the want of illustrations, especially with regard to the latter house, which, though of considerable interest, is little known, except locally. A ground plan of Woodspring would have been particularly serviceable, as the fifteenth-century remains are extensive, though the writer has restricted his attention almost entirely to the church, which now serves for a farmer's parlour. He repeats an error which appears to have originated with Collinson, the historian of Somerset, and has been repeated onward to Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury* and down to the meeting of the Royal Archaeological Institute at Taunton in 1879, that the priory, which belonged to Augustinian canons, was founded by William de Courtenay, said to be a descendant, "probably grandson," of William de Tracy, who struck the first blow in the tragedy which for centuries after made Canterbury Cathedral so famous a place of pilgrimage. Though related to De Tracy, it was, as has been shown by Mr. A. S. Ellis of Westminster, as grandson and heir through his mother, of Reginald Fitz Urse, a leading actor in the same tragic scene, that William de Courtenay inherited Wrotham and Worspring or Woodspring, near Weston-super-Mare. The convent in its original form was an expiatory chapel, founded in honour of St. Thomas the Martyr, apparently by Reginald Fitz Urse himself, and converted into a priory, between the years 1205 and 1214, by William de Courtenay, whose father, Robert, had been buried in the chapel.

Did our limits allow, we might have liked to delay over the "Study on Poets' Corner," by Mr. Henry Poole, the Master Mason of Westminster Abbey, whose former paper on St. Blaise's Chapel in the same building, as well as the present, leads us to hope that his architectural studies have not yet ceased. We can only mention, as worthy of notice, Sir J. H. Ramsay's

"Accounts of the Reign of Richard II."; also a readable paper on "Early Omnibuses in Paris," by Mr. W. E. A. Axon; "The First Parliament in America," by Mr. W. Noel Sainsbury; and "Monmouthshire as a Shire Marcher," by Mr. Hubert Hall. The "Right of Pre-emption in Village Communities," by Mr. John Fenton, contains some curious illustrations of land tenure in Germany, as compared with similar holdings in India.

The present volume does credit alike to editor, printer, and publisher; and, while in the two latter respects there was little need of improvement, there is, as compared with the former volumes, increased strength in the treatment of subjects, while these, on the whole, have been judiciously selected.

TUNIS UNDER THE FRENCH.*

MR. REID may fairly congratulate himself on having performed the not inconsiderable feat of writing 312 fairly readable pages on absolutely nothing. We do not mean that Tunis, which is the country Mr. Reid thinks better described as the Land of the Bey, is nothing. If he had written on that, then it would be "unnecessary to offer any apology for the publication of this volume," to quote from his introduction. The world has heard a great deal about Tunis lately, and is likely to hear much more; and the world is supposed to be always willing to read about countries which are being forced on its attention by the morning papers. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Reid's book can only be said to be on Tunis by a figure of speech. It is mostly about the author, the steamers he journeyed in, the inns he tried to sleep in, and the servant he employed during a very short stay in the country. His experiences might well be told in about the space which the old gentleman whom Tom Jones met on the hill devoted to his journeyings. The results are almost identical. But the *Zeitgeist* has been at work since *Tom Jones* was written, and has, among other things, blown up the bulk of books of travel. A reasonable man will be satisfied if the bubble is bright and light. Now Mr. Reid is both. He writes in the best style of the newspaper Correspondent, and that is frequently good. He never exceeds in travellers' fun, and he abstains from preaching. At times, indeed, he indulges in solemn reflections without much provocation. When comfortably seated on the deck of the *Charles Quint* on his way to Bona (which, by the by, he degrades into Bone, after the example of the French), he could not help "thinking of last Saturday, and contrasting my surroundings then—when I found myself one of thirty thousand human beings packed into the Leeds Cloth Hall yard, or rather into the fine 'Gladstone Hall' erected on the spot—with the situation in which I am placed to-day." With the help of reflections of this sort, how easy would it be for the young person ambitious of keeping a diary to fill the pages which persist in remaining blank! It would come in so handily to compare his or her surroundings while standing on the refuge in Piccadilly Circus with the position in which they were placed while eating their toast at breakfast. Again, the Feast of the Bairam suggests to Mr. Reid the profound and original observation that "These good Tunisians are not the only people in the world, however, who keep up forms and ceremonies long after the life has gone out of them." There is not, it is true, much of this; and Mr. Reid keeps pretty steadily to his amusing account of how nothing went on happening to him all the while he was in the Regency.

The author makes no sort of claim to knowing anything about his subject, or, as he himself says, "I make no pretensions to any special knowledge of Tunis." He had seen the north coast of Africa from the deck of a steamer, and he knew his geography. There is no safer rule to go by in judging a book of travel than that what a traveller learns of a country is in exact proportion to his previous knowledge. When that is nothing, it will bring forth after its kind. The safest thing, therefore, to conclude about Mr. Reid's account of the very small part of the Regency he saw is that it represents, not the truth, but what the surface of things looks like to inquiring gentlemen from Leeds. Considered from that point of view it is instructive. There is a story told of himself by Blanco White which illustrates admirably the value of observation of this kind. On his way up to London when he first landed in this country, Blanco White saw painted on the wall of a large building by the roadside the words "Cannon Brewery." Now he knew what a cannon was, and he also knew the meaning of the verb to brew, and, seeing them put together in this way, he combined his information, and made a note of the interesting fact that the English idiom is to brew cannons. On wider knowledge he found he had been hasty in jumping at conclusions. We shall not have the least hesitation in deciding that the knowledge Mr. Reid gained of Tunis in the course of a few weeks was essentially of this character. When he tells us that Mohammed, the "curio" seller, from whom he purchased various articles after the usual wrangling, was "a real Arab gentleman," we discount the value of the judgment by remembering that Mr. Reid could only speak to him through an interpreter, and never saw him except in his little stall in the Bazaar. We may also be safely sceptical as to the general truth of his assertions of what the people as a body wish and hope. Indeed, Mr. Reid began with an ad-

venture quite as exciting as any of the others, which throws a sinister light on the value of his judgments. At Marseilles he, in honour of Thackeray, and not without copious quotation, of which we are very far from inclined to complain, resolved to eat a dish of Bouillabaisse. He had never done so before, and, in spite of a strong desire to like it, he found it very nasty. On this he hastily concluded that "Thackeray must have been more *gourmand* than *gourmet* if he really liked it." Now the right conclusion to be arrived at by an admirer of the ballad is that the particular dish of "Bouillabaisse" was not properly cooked. Mr. Reid should at least have given some proof of his determination to inquire strictly into the state of things at Tunis by trying another dish of Bouillabaisse at another restaurant.

The history of the traveller's stay in Tunis is short and simple. He spent a few weeks in the city itself and a few days in Susa. He arrived soon after the French occupation, and found the inhabitants very sulky. Terrible stories of all kinds were flying about, and it was declared to be unsafe for any European to venture beyond the walls. The patriots were raiding up to the very gates of the town. For these heroes Mr. Reid seems to feel an amount of sympathy which we find it difficult to share. Their exertions in the cause of their country and their faith seem to take the shape of indiscriminate pillage of everybody, their countrymen included, who is too weak to oppose them. Like the Spanish *guerrilleros*, another African institution, these patriots have a remarkable alacrity in sinking into brigands. Mr. Reid, becoming tired of confinement, expressed a strong wish to view the beauties of nature from a certain farmhouse on the hills in full sight of the walls. He was deterred on being informed that the inhabitants of the steading had all been carried off by raiders the very day before. In all probability these unlucky people, at least such of them as survived the horrors of their involuntary journey inland, are now slaves to their patriotic countrymen who have drawn the sword for Tunis and the Prophet. On this occasion Mr. Reid showed a certain want of enterprise. A traveller properly earnest in search of adventures would have visited that farmhouse, despite the beards of confederate Arab patriots, and have given us a touching picture of its desolation, or have made a case for H.M.'s Consul. Later on Mr. Reid showed equal discretion. Having made his way to Susa, intent on accompanying a convoy to Kairwan, he allowed himself to be stopped by the artless device of a French colonel, who said the thing which was not about the starting of a convoy. The Vice-Consul, indeed, told him that it would be madness to follow on alone, and Mr. Reid believed him. Perhaps the Vice-Consul was right; but what would Captain Burnaby, what would Mr. McGahan, what would so many heroes of travel have done in this difficulty? The question needs no answer. Mr. Reid says that the story of his journey to Kairwan is the history of a failure; and so it is—of a failure to try. We are firmly convinced that he behaved very wisely, and that Kairwan was not worth the risk; but the travels of the wise in troubled lands are not usually very interesting. As he could not sleep in his inn at Susa on a sack of shavings, and recoiled from his landlady's food, he did well not to try camping out in the open; but was it worth the trouble to go to Susa, look in the direction of Kairwan, shiver through a miserable night, and then come back and tell all about so little? And it would appear that Arab patriots are not without some discrimination. An English sailor belonging to a shipwrecked vessel had been sent along the coast to do some work on the wreck, and found himself compelled to walk back to Tunisia. On his way he was thrice stopped, and on the first plundered completely of the little he had to lose; but the robbers spared his life on being assured that he was no Frenchman. The story shows that the Arabs have a confiding innocence, or a wonderfully high opinion of a Frenchman's patriotism, if they suppose him incapable of denying his nationality at such a pass. Mr. Reid was not impossible one more victim to the wiliness of the British tar on the hunt for a tip.

In fact, beyond talking politics to the Consul, Mr. Reid came very little in the way of the remarkable things that have been happening in the Regency. Like the ordinary tourist in peaceful times, he was compelled to devote himself to the study of the picturesque. Of that there is abundance in Tunis. The usual accompaniments are there, too—laziness, ignorance, stupidity, rags, discomfort, vermin, and the other virtues of the children of nature. But they are picturesque. Not only is Tunis more Oriental than Stamboul (which sounds so much more travelled than Constantinople), as it very well may be, but it is Oriental in a particularly delightful manner. Again and again Mr. Reid wishes he was a painter—he has so many very original wishes—so that he might give a just idea of what the market-places, houses, wells, or people look like. As he is not a painter, Mr. Reid, with a just sense of the limits of the arts, does not try to do what only a painter can effect. He keeps his descriptions within reasonable bounds. Some of the dresses he saw certainly must have made him feel that at last he had reached the very home of the picturesque, but might well have suggested the inquiry whether it is not curiously like a good deal of what the supporters of the British drama can see at the Gaiety Theatre. "One of the first things to strike my attention," Mr. Reid tells us, "was the extraordinary costume of the Jewish women—a costume quite unlike anything I had seen before either in Eastern Europe or Asia Minor. It consists of a short silk jacket and white tights, the latter displaying the shape of the limbs to advantage." Truly the world is very small, as our author finely observed when, to his ineffable amazement, he met a fellow-townsman from Leeds who was an engineer in Tunis. Of course "curios" abound in

* *The Land of the Bey; being Impressions of Tunis under the French.* By T. Wemyss Reid. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1882.

such a home of the picturesque. Any one who thinks them worth the trouble of four or five tedious wrangles and a shower-bath of volatile lies can get them for moderate prices in the Bazaar. By far the greatest curio Mr. Reid seems to have come across was a Frenchman from Marseilles, who thought Glasgow "was infinitely to be preferred as a place of residence to London." We do not even except "a remarkable Arab rifle with revolving barrels" which he saw in a collection of arms formed by the British Vice-Consul at Susa. Even if one could be quite sure that it was of Arab manufacture, it would not be so striking a proof as Mr. Reid supposes that "there is nothing new under the sun." There used to be, and probably still is, a revolver in the Indian Museum which, like this rifle, is "certainly more than a hundred years old." At the end Mr. Reid gives a special chapter to politics, but we are pained to have to say that it is highly uninteresting. He tells nothing which was not long ago the common property of all the world. Hints are dropped about mysteries of iniquity he heard tell of on good authority, but can say nothing about, because it would be indiscreet to forestall M. Pelletan. M. Pelletan has told all about it, and more too, and M. Roustan has brought his action and lost it, and been sent back to Tunis and promoted on to the shelf. Mme. Elias and the rest of the "entourage" have disappeared, and who cares anything more about them either in or out of "The Land of the Bey"?

RIVERS AND CANALS.*

IMMENSE advances have been made within the last few years in the scientific problem and the practical development of inland navigation. The successful enterprise and economical working of the Suez Canal opened up a new era in this important department of engineering science; and not a few works which seem destined to dwarf what were once thought the gigantic proportions of M. Lesseps's design are exciting the attention of sovereign States no less than the genius and energy of men of science, and the wakeful ambition of the speculative classes. More than one enterprise rivaling that work in boldness and magnitude has been successfully carried to completion; others are in progress, or in the earlier stage of organization. The Amsterdam ship canal has been finished and opened; a new outlet has been provided for the river Maas; and considerable progress has been made in the improvement works on the rivers Clyde, Tyne, and Tees. Vast operations have been carried on for improving the navigable condition of the delta of the Mississippi, where unforeseen and all but overwhelming calls have lately been made upon the skill and energy of Transatlantic engineers by the floods which have breached the lower levees and inundated thousands of square miles of valuable land. The Legislature of France has given a preliminary consent to the gigantic scheme of a ship canal to connect the waters of the Atlantic with those of the Mediterranean. Other works of recent date have become sufficiently matured to resolve the interest attaching to them into the estimate practically to be formed of the conditions and the cost of maintenance, with their economical returns.

There seems, therefore, room for a book presenting in a concise and readable form descriptions of the principal engineering works of late years on rivers and canals, both at home and abroad, with the principles on which they are based. Valuable treatises of this class have been put forth by French writers, such as that of MM. de Lagrené and Malézieux on inland navigation; and much rich material has been accumulated in the *Annales des Ponts et Chaussées*. Being invited to deliver a course of lectures on River and Canal Engineering at the School of Military Engineering, Chatham, Mr. L. F. Vernon-Harcourt was led to undertake a work of this kind for the use of students and the public at large, drawing his materials from the best available sources, and embodying in his survey the latest and most important developments of hydraulic science and practice both in this and other countries. The Transactions of the Institution of Civil Engineers have, as might have been expected, supplied a considerable proportion of the subject-matter, and to the Council of that society the writer acknowledges himself indebted for the loan of several of the illustrations which give much of its value to his compilation. Besides the woodcuts which are interspersed amidst the letterpress, upwards of twenty plates, clearly drawn and reproduced on stone, making up the second volume of the work, enable the reader to follow the descriptions of the author. Beginning with some general considerations upon the physical characteristics of rainfall, the natural flow and storage of water in rivers and lakes, and the velocity of streams and torrents, with the formulae and instruments employed in their measurement, the author passes on to the artificial processes which have from the earliest times been applied to the control and the utilization of these agents of nature. The most primitive use made of the natural flow of rivers was to float down stream the trees felled in the forests. To carry these trees or rafts over shallows and sandbanks the idea was conceived of producing artificial floods, damming up the stream by banks of earth, timber, or wattles, until a considerable head of water

had accumulated, which was suddenly let go, the result being an artificial flood which carried the stranded masses over the obstacle. This operation of flushing by means of stanches was in extensive use on many rivers of France in the earlier years of the present century, as well as on the Thames and Severn. Our author quotes the description of the stanches on the Severn given by Sir W. Cubitt, by whom they were removed in the year 1842 when he was carrying out some improvement works. Similar relics of this most simple order of river hydraulics are still to be seen on the Thames above Oxford. More scientific appliances came in time to be introduced, in the form of jetties across and along the river bed, bends and cuts for easing and training the stream, as well as removing the shoals by dredging. The most important step in advance was the canalization of an existing river, or making artificial channels for training natural streams, both for the purposes of navigation and irrigation. It is difficult to say how early in the history of engineering we are to place the origin of this practice. Even the introduction of locks, made necessary by differences of level, is by no means easily to be traced. Our author is not prepared with any example of the pound-lock earlier than the Italian canals of the fifteenth century. We are surprised at his passing over those contrivances by way of locks and sluices which we know not only from written records, but from the stupendous vestiges still remaining, to have been widely used in Egypt and in the Delta of the Tigris and Euphrates. Scarcely can modern hydraulics point to a more stupendous enterprise than the Labyrinth, which Herodotus, who saw it in its glory and efficiency, ranked far above the pyramids, an immense work of storage for the irrigation of the Fayoum. For centuries buried beneath the sand, its grand galleries and intercepting walls are in process of being brought to light and their mode of action traced. Upon their artificial water system, in fact, both Egypt and Mesopotamia may be said to have been built up, and with the neglect and abandonment of these conditions of their vitality those countries relapsed almost entirely into wastes of sand.

Mr. Vernon-Harcourt's object, however, is not so much the history as the latest development of his science. He instances the best descriptions of locks, gates, and caissons under widely different local conditions, and with reference to the materials and modes of construction available. The securing of foundations and containing walls by clay, masonry, brick work, or concrete, is of course a primary point in a treatise of this kind. The contrivances for dredging, piling, puddling, underpinning, and discharging water are enumerated, with the most improved machinery for excavating, including the newly-introduced sand-pump. Cofferdams and caissons of various sorts are described—in particular, Sir Joseph Bazalgette's system of cylindrical iron caissons used for the Thames Embankment, given in plan and elevation in Plate II.; the more familiar modes of damming by means of timber piling, with sand, fascines, and puddled clay, being illustrated from works at the Zuyder Zee Locks, the Schellingwoude dam, and the jetty at Hoek van Holland. Movable weirs are well represented by highly ingenious designs, chiefly from Port Villez, the Coly Weir, and other works connected with the navigation of the Seine and Marne. Some admirable designs for self-acting sluices for discharging the overfall waters are to be seen in Chanoine's shutter-weirs at Port à l'Anglais and other works on the Seine, the drum-weir on the Marne, and the segmental gate-weir at La Monnaie, on the Seine. For reservoir dams and quay walls excellent examples are chosen from the Thames Embankment works, Millwall, Liverpool, and Chatham, Sheerness, and the West India Docks, the Montaubry Reservoir and Furens dams, and those at Puentés and Alicante. Theoretical sections are added to indicate the maximum pressures on masonry, in one case to 85 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs., in the other to 200 lbs. on the square inch, which power of resistance was enjoined in the case of the Almanza dam in Spain, erected three centuries ago, and still sound. We should have liked some more practical definitions of the limits and conditions of stability as affected by hydraulic upward pressure, to be illustrated from the recent partial failure of the Chelsea Embankment, and the collapse of the far older structure of the quay wall at the East India Dock.

In Plate VIII. we have an example of the most effective and economical forms of movable bridges, selected from a paper by Mr. James Price. The most convenient and most commonly adopted type, that of the swing bridge, turning horizontally on a pivot or pivots according as the span is single or double, is best exemplified by that at Marseilles, with a single lattice girder 126 feet in length from the pivot, and that at Quincey over the Mississippi, 180 feet. The Hull South Bridge, 121 feet in length, with a tail end of no more than 49 feet, involves the defect of an counterpoise of 500 tons, whereas the weight of the bridge itself is only 300 tons. Of wrought-iron bridges with double segments, each 350 tons in weight, forming an arch when closed, the finest instance is that at Brest, over the river Penfeld, having a clear opening of 350 feet between the piers, and a span of 385 feet between the centres of the supports. It is moved by manual labour, closing in a quarter of an hour. There is no need to dilate on the superiority, from a mechanical point of view, of hydraulic power, and on a large scale its economy will be no less proved in practice. M. Barret, the designer of the Marseilles bridge, is, we are told, confident of constructing a swing bridge of 2,500 tons, to be opened for traffic in fifteen minutes. Another ingenious type is Mr. Price's floating swing bridge at Dublin, rotating upon a buoy which floats in a well in one of the abut-

* *A Treatise on Rivers and Canals; Relating to the Control and Improvement of Rivers, and the Design, Construction, and Development of Canals.* By Leveson Francis Vernon-Harcourt, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford, Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1882.

ments, and which, being always kept submerged, is not affected by the changes of water-level in the well. Bascule bridges, rising and sinking upon a single horizontal hinge, like the time-honoured drawbridge, are illustrated by that over the Ouse at Selby, having a span of 45 feet. The largest hitherto erected, opened a few years ago at Copenhagen, spans an opening of 50 $\frac{2}{3}$ feet. That at Bristol, 42 feet wide, with a rise of 46 feet, is opened by steam power in half a minute. Of traversing bridges worked horizontally upon rollers by hydraulic power, we are given an example from the Millwall Docks. Three chapters full of condensed and instructive matter are devoted to canals both inland and marine, going back to the Caer and Foss dykes of the Roman period, and marking the successive strides which have led to the great undertakings of the last few years. Our author's survey takes in the magnificent canal systems of America and British India. Irrigation, far more than navigation, has been the object of the Indian Government, a sum of 10,570,000/- having been thus expended between the years 1867 and 1878. The large-scale plans of the Suez, the Panama, and the Amsterdam ship canals are especially worthy of study, giving ample details of matters of level, excavating, and embanking. The system of locks at the North Sea end of the great Dutch canal affords admirable models of what can be done with fascine work, basalt pitching, and sheet-piling, though the tides offer nothing like the difficulty that our own engineers have to meet in the extraordinary rise and fall of certain of our coast and river waters. Floods of rivers, the means of mitigating their effects, the storage and discharge of water, and the most prominent schemes for improving tidal rivers, occupy the latter, and not the least important and instructive, portion of the book. The historical sketch of the Thames, the Mersey, the Severn, and the Dee will have perhaps most interest for home readers; but there is hardly a river of note in the Old or New World that has not its record traced. A copious index adds greatly to the usefulness of Mr. Vernon-Harcourt's excellent work.

TOWNSEND ON SCHOLASTICISM.*

MR. TOWNSEND has done a useful work in bringing before English readers "an account of the lives" of the leading Schoolmen, "and the services they rendered to the Church and the world." And his testimony to their merits derives additional weight from his writing, not only as a Protestant, but, as we should infer from some passages, as what is called an Evangelical Protestant. It is true that the old-fashioned Philistine contempt for Scholasticism, like the contempt for Gothic architecture, was already passing away, thanks in great measure to the labours of German Rationalistic critics. No modern writer would quite venture to assert with Hobbes that "those who wrote volumes of such stuff were mad, and intended to make others so," or even to repeat the shallow sneer here cited from Mosheim. But it is difficult to deny that, in this country at least, the Schoolmen "still lie under a load of obloquy," or did till very recently, in view of the marvellous estimates even of such authorities as Hallam—who wondered that so many as four Englishmen could be found to pay any attention to Thomas Aquinas—and Mr. G. H. Lewes, who summarily dismisses the whole Scholastic literature as "monstrous and lifeless," and "having no more interest for us than that yielded by the megatherium and dinornis." It is more inexplicable that the learned historian of *Latin Christianity*, whom Mr. Townsend does not quote, and who might have been expected to know better, should gravely assure us that "of the vast monuments of Scholastic theology which amaze and appal the mind, the sole survival to posterity is that barren amazement." Mr. Townsend is able, however, to appeal to many competent and impartial witnesses—notably, among English writers, Sir W. Hamilton, Sir James Mackintosh, Coleridge, Hampden, and Maurice—for a very different and juster estimate. He might have added the names of J. S. Mill, Archbishop Trench, and the late Professor Shirley, the latter of whom insists that "the tomes of the Schoolmen not only bespeak an amount of literary toil rare in the most cultivated times, but give evidence of a precision of thought and a subtlety of logical analysis which may challenge comparison with the best works of the best ages of philosophy." Archbishop Trench has correctly enough defined their central aim as being not merely to formulate and arrange the vast assortment of materials inherited from the patristic age, but to effect "the reconciliation of faith and reason by giving its due rights to each," and thus "to inaugurate a supernatural rationalism in the Church." It is true, no doubt, as was inevitable under the intellectual conditions of the age, that their method was a one-sided one and their data were inadequate, and that they often expended their energies on trivial or incongruous discussions; but it is not the less absurd to set them down as no better than "very solemn triflers," or to deny the keen metaphysical acumen and profound erudition many of them display. St. Anselm e.g. who must be regarded as the father or pioneer of Scholasticism, framed the ontological argument for the existence of God which has been reproduced in substance by Descartes and Hegel; the intricate questions about the nature of saving faith, grace, and predestination, still warmly contested among rival schools of divines, were handled in all their

bearings by a succession of Schoolmen from St. Bernard downwards; and Mackintosh says rightly enough that "scarcely any metaphysical controversy agitated among recent philosophers was unknown to them." Sir W. Hamilton and Hampden, not to cite the weighty testimony of eminent German writers, speak quite as strongly in the same sense. And their contributions to ethical science, as Mackintosh points out, were still more conspicuous and permanent—a remark which applies especially to Aquinas, "for three centuries the Moral Master of Christendom." To condemn the Schoolmen for their technical and systematic method of dealing with Christian doctrine is to forget "that man is a *reasoning* being," led by the same inevitable tendency to form systems of religious as of scientific truth. "To object to one realm of knowledge being subjected to logical system, and permit the application of such method to others, is to give up the guidance of reason, and to become the victim of wayward and arbitrary decisions, determined by passion or selfishness." And hence in seeking to formulate a science of revealed truth "the Schoolmen only strove to express in clear systematic form the belief of the Christian consciousness of their times," based on the informal statements of Scripture. Nor can the popular objection to their employment of what is stigmatized as "a harsh, crabbed, incomprehensible jargon" be pressed, when we remember that no subject can be scientifically treated without the use of a special terminology, while in fact there are comparatively few of the terms employed by the leading Schoolmen which have not passed into the accepted philosophical or theological nomenclature of modern Europe. Moreover this charge, *valeat quantum*, might be retorted with at least equal force on "scientists" of our own day:—

Few can write more fluent or pure English than Professor Huxley, when treating upon those sciences to the special study of which he has consecrated so many years of his life. Yet in the course of about twenty lines of one of his treatises we read of "the sacral axis," "the ilium," "the sacral articulation," "the acetabulum," "the pubis and the ischium," "the obturator foramen," "the obturator axis," "the ilipectenial axis," "the ventri rami of the pubes," "the symphysis," "the cotyloid ramus," "the metischial process," "the homologues of the rami, of the psyploid," with much more of the same kind. All this occurs in describing one bone in the structure of an animal called the "Ornithorhynchus." In another treatise by the same writer such terms perpetually occur as "blastomer," "blastoderm," "nodal and internodal," "epiblast," "hypoblast," and "mesoblast," "apical and cambium," "utricile" and "epithelium," "germation," "fission," "gamogenesis," "ogamogenesis," "abio genesis," "biogenesis," "urodele," "anurous," and so on indefinitely. From many modern works on Chemistry, Physiology, and Mental Philosophy terms might be quoted as harsh and abstract as these.

Mr. Townsend, whose book is manifestly designed for general reading, does not attempt to enter deeply into the philosophical problems raised by the Schoolmen, but he gives us an interesting and in the main accurate sketch of the lives and teaching of the principal "doctors," which may be appreciated by many who have no claim to be considered theological or historical experts. It is a pardonable license to include in such a volume Alcuin and Scotus Erigena, who lived more than two centuries before the real opening of the Scholastic period, which may be said to begin with the controversy between Lanfranc and Berenger on the Eucharist, while it had virtually closed before the time of Gerson, who has a final chapter allotted to him; indeed the author himself observes that Gerson's mysticism marked an unmistakable reaction from Scholasticism. We cannot of course follow him in detail through his account of the various great doctors—the "Universal," the "Irrefragable," the "Seraphic," the "Angelic," the "Subtle," the "Invincible," the "Solemn," the "Resolute," and the rest, and must content ourselves with noting a few salient points. It is true of course that there was a certain rationalistic, rather than Protestant, element in Scholasticism, notably exemplified in writers like Abelard, and in Scotus Erigena before him, and accordingly strenuous opposition was offered at first to the naturalization of Aristotle in the Church, on whose philosophy the Schoolmen of the second and more systematic period built so much. But it is not very intelligible to say that "the early Protestantism of the age, inarticulated (?) even to itself, found a quick response in the mind of Charlemagne." The teaching of Erigena is justly characterized as "pantheistic in its basis, with a biblical terminology surrounded with ecclesiastical accidents," whether or not Mr. F. D. Maurice was right in his "almost passionate denial" that Erigena was himself a pantheist. Milman thinks he became one, but we are disposed to acquiesce in Ozanam's more charitable verdict—which is the most favourable that can reasonably be admitted—that he "paused on the brink of pantheism." Mr. Townsend's treatment of Aquinas, the greatest of the Schoolmen, is appreciative and just, as far as it goes, and he has rightly distinguished between him and his unequal but still illustrious successor, Duns Scotus, in pointing out that, while the latter was "essentially a critic and a polemic, Aquinas was a philosopher." The exposition of the theological system of Duns Scotus is not always correct, as e.g. in the strange assertion that "he evidently believed Christ had a real human personality"—which would make him a Nestorian; nor is sufficient stress laid on the theory of the motive of the Incarnation named from him, which has materially affected the course of later theology both before and after the Reformation; and Mr. Townsend does not appear to recognize the close connexion between this view of his and his teaching on the Immaculate Conception. But these are defects easily explicable in a writer who is not a theologian.

There are other inaccuracies both of fact and of terminology in

* *The Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages.* By W. J. Townsend. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

the volume which are less excusable. It is odd, for instance, to speak of the difficulties about the union of Abelard and Heloise turning on "the spirit of the age, which was so far in favour of celibacy that marriage in a public teacher of philosophy or religion was a certain barrier to his success." Surely the author must be aware that Abelard was precluded, not merely by the spirit of the age, but by the express rule of the Church, from a marriage which Gregory VII. had about the time of his birth made not only illicit but absolutely invalid. What, again, can be possibly meant by telling us that, before the election of Pope Gregory X. in 1272, "the chair of Peter had been vacant about fifteen years"? Gregory was elected in 1271, not 1272, and the vacancy between his accession and the death of Clement IV., who became Pope in 1265 and died in 1268, lasted three years, not fifteen. It is less wonderful perhaps that Mr. Townsend should blindly follow, without examining it, the received Protestant tradition, enshrined in a famous couplet of Coleridge's, about the burning of John Huss at Constance, "in spite of the safe conduct given by Sigismund." We may deplore the burning of Huss, as we deplore other mediæval persecutions of heretics, but Hefele has proved to demonstration that the safe conduct of the Emperor for his journey to and from the Council neither did nor possibly could guarantee him against the judgment of the Council itself, to which he had appealed and professed his entire readiness to submit, nor did Huss or his friends so understand it at the time. Neither could the Council, when challenged, have pronounced any other verdict, for by any standard of heresy then acknowledged, or indeed if judged by the tests of heresy still very generally accepted, without as well as within the Roman pale, Huss was unquestionably a heretic, and at that day it was a no less unquestioned principle that heretics ought to be burnt. That policy we may condemn as severely as we please, but it is absurd to characterize as the one blot on Gerson's otherwise stainless reputation his taking an active part in a procedure, however deplorable, which, in accordance with principles then universally acknowledged, he must have regarded as both necessary and just. It is a less important error, but still one which should have been avoided in a work of this kind, to call Peter Lombard, who first formulated the doctrine of seven sacraments, "a severe sacramentarian," meaning evidently sacramentalist. The author might have learned from Hooker that the term "Sacramentarian" first came into use in the sixteenth century to designate those who denied, not those who rigidly asserted, the reality of sacramental grace; it was applied to the Zwinglians. Mr. Townsend does not at all exaggerate the reputation long enjoyed by the *Quatuor Libri Sententiarium*. Fleury tells us that this compilation, together with Gratian's *Decretum*, and the Ecclesiastical History of Peter Manducator, sufficed in the opinion of the age to form a complete theological library. One peculiarity of the Schoolmen, as distinguished from the intellectual leaders of other periods, is well brought out in the following passage, and is worth putting on record, though it does not directly affect our estimate of their literary work:—

They were men of devout habit and of stainless piety. There is scarcely any line of men in all history who are so irreproachable as the Schoolmen. Scandal has left untouched but few of the leading men of history. Especially in the Middle Ages, but a scanty number were able to pass through the fiery ordeal of life without being scarred or branded by some sad act or habit of sin. Charlemagne and all kings, with but the rare exception of an Alfred, or a Saint Louis; Popes and Cardinals far too numerous to mention, and too hateful to recall; statesmen and warriors of all the civilized nations of Europe,—all were swept into the evil habits of their times, and indulged in such forms of vice that the mind can only tolerate them by judging their conduct, not by the eternal and immutable standard of Divine righteousness, but by the imperfect and changing standard acknowledged by the public conscience of their generations. Even the clerical orders which arose to bear witness against the surrounding rapacity and licentiousness were unable to preserve themselves unspotted, and gradually suffered themselves to be drawn downwards by the prevailing spirit of evil until the half-developed moral sensibility of Christendom was horrified at their apostacy. Not only so, the great thinkers and leaders of the modern world have far too seldom been able to pass the trial of human temptation without reproach; the great founder of French Idealism confesses that he could not preserve his chastity absolutely pure; the leader of the Inductive Philosophy is only rescued from being

"The noblest, greatest, meanest of mankind."

by the plea that the low condition of public morality in his day excused or palliated the wrongs he committed in the course of his public functions; the greatest literary name in Germany, by his own free and unblushing confessions of immorality, is found to be tarnished with the saddest shame. And whilst these examples are numberless, let not the tribute of praise and admiration be withheld from a succession of men who through several centuries maintained an almost faultless confession of morality, and who deserve consecration in the estimation of the religious world for the rich odour of their piety. Of no other order of men, save only the Apostles, can the same be said.

It is, perhaps, more remarkable that, far from being, as is often imagined, monastic recluses weaving metaphysical cobwebs in the dreamy solitude of the cloister, most of the Schoolmen were men of action as well as men of thought, familiar with the life of Courts and Cabinets, and prominently engaged in the affairs of Church and State. This double aspect of the life of Anselm is admirably exhibited in Dean Church's biography of him, and the same is true more or less of nearly all the leading Schoolmen of the next three centuries, with the exception of Duns Scotus, who died at the age of thirty-four. In spite of the inevitable disadvantages, both internal and external, under which they laboured, their want of critical resources, of historical and linguistic know-

ledge, and of the habits of introspective reflection which are of later growth, it cannot fairly be denied that the Schoolmen did a great work in their day, which has left permanent traces on the development of both philosophical and religious thought.

LADY DEANE.*

WE wish that Mrs. Leith Adams, who is capable of far better things, would not be content to fall back on the fashions and trivialities of the worst contemporary fiction. Her *Aunt Hepsy's Foundling* struck us as an almost perfect novel of the kind; nor did it interest us only because the scenes were laid in a colony that is unfamiliar but far from unattractive. There were fresh, firmly-drawn, and original characters; there was a love story that was singularly piquant and moving; while there was plenty of good description both of men and things, with a pleasant undercurrent of quaint humour. We have praised that former book of hers all the more because we can say so little in favour of the present work. We opened it full of hope, and read it with growing disappointment; though we are bound to add that *Lady Deane*, which comes first among the stories, is decidedly the most disappointing and least satisfactory. It is morbidly fantastic and yet provokingly conventional. Semi-supernatural machinery is injudiciously introduced among the very commonplace heroes and heroines of modern sensational fiction. Natures most glaringly incongruous and extravagant do nothing more worthy of their phenomenal individualities than mouth high-sounding phrases in sonorous periods; for the sins they commit, although reprehensible enough, are within the reach of the most ordinary imaginations. And in this collection of stories the author makes the wildest work with the physical characteristics of her male and female beauties. She tinges their locks with the arts of a Mme. Rachel or a dyer of the Augustan age, and defines the colours of their eyes by double-jointed epithets that convey dubious impressions as they suggest vague possibilities. We have an unpleasant suspicion of what is awaiting us when we are introduced to a Christabel on the opening page. Like Coleridge's wonderful maiden, this Christabel is "beautiful exceedingly," and her lover tells her so point-blank, in the very first line of the volumes. "You are so lovely, Christabel." So we are presented to the conventional picture of the pair of lackadaisical lovers. There is the typical "calm and gentle content" in the girl's dreamy look; while in the eyes of the gentleman, who stands stupidly gazing on her, is the customary wistful eagerness. We know, of course, that the spaniel-like expression of his stare expresses a fatuity or a facility which will be fatally abused. Yet Christabel, it must be confessed, was well worth looking at, by those at least who admire the latest thing in waxwork carefully modelled after the fashion of the season's fiction. She had rippling locks, and tiny shell-like ears, and a nose which "had that slight upward curve that, combined with a short upper lip, gives to a woman's face a piquancy at once bright and sweet." She has a lithe waist besides, and her tresses are warm-coloured and burnished, and she is dressed in aesthetic tints and with an appropriate negligence that do infinite credit to her coquettish instincts. The youth and the maiden are old acquaintances—in fact, they have associated with each other from childhood; and we should have said that the brotherly and sisterly familiarity must have been antipathetical to convulsive emotions. But we have stumbled upon them seemingly at a happy moment for an author's dramatic effects. In the course of six or eight pages, chiefly occupied with elaborate portrait-painting, the gentleman's voice has become hoarse with passion, and the lady's sunny calm has been troubled. In a score of pages more, he has surprised her into a pledge of betrothal, and solemnly sealed the engagement with "reverent" kisses. Yet we naturally surmise that they are never meant to marry; especially when we find that the gentleman's mother has an iron will and a diabolical temper, an absolute freedom from moral scruples, and a passionate jealousy of the attachment of her only child. But we do expect, since Lady Deane has been elaborated in the most effective style of Miss Braddon or "Ouida," that she is to figure conspicuously and criminally as a matrimonial obstructionist. That, however, is not the case. It is true, and the fact is mentioned incidentally, that she has driven a respectable husband to drink and self-destruction; but she looks on, metaphysically speaking, with folded arms, while her son plays his little love drama with a weakness which she must have heartily despised. His ever-present doubt as to the sincerity of Christabel's attachment to him changes on inadequate grounds into a momentary conviction when a letter reaches him in Switzerland while he is in a mood of morbid depression. And, in place of writing to give the girl up, and going in for exercise among the peaks and passes, by way of tonic and alterative, he impetuously shuffles off the mortal coil, precipitating himself into a ravine that happens to be convenient. As for Christabel, she takes the shock, such as it was, much more sensibly. There is as much calm in her mind as there was in her eyes when we first met her. The burnished tresses, the tempting short lip, and the lithe waist are promptly placed at the disposal of one of those poor and devoted village clergymen who are become as common as blackberries in recent fiction. She had befooled him during the months she had believed herself an engaged woman; and had subsequently sent him a solemn farewell in what reads

* *Lady Deane; and other Stories.* By Mrs. Leith Adams, Author of "My Land of Beulah," &c. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1882.

to us like a message of mockery. She had charged an invalid sister, who was bound up in him, to tell the unlucky person that, if ever she became a helpful woman or lived up to the highest standard of life, she would owe it all to him. This was pretty strong, as must be admitted, if we remember that the first fruits of Mr. Wedderburn's beneficent influence had been to make her deliberately wring his heart by giving him delusive but unmistakable encouragement. We are glad to say, however, that there is one personage in *Lady Deane* who reminds us of some of the delightful rustics in *Aunt Hepzibah*. Old Jim Grappleby, the village bell-ringer, is really good, with a store of quaint sayings and apposite anecdote, and we only regret we see so little of him.

As for "Mrs. Armytage," she was, like Christabel, a wonderful beauty, and even stronger in the point of her luxuriant capillary attractions. She wore her hair, which was at once dusky and bright, coiled in clusters of tresses behind her "perfectly-formed" head; while her only child, on whom she lavished all her domestic affection, was "a wee four-year old fairy with golden locks." Mrs. Armytage has thrown herself away upon a brute of a husband, who torments her through that darling child; and she has given her heart, though in all honour and purity, to a brother officer of the military surgeon who tells the story. This Oscar Temple is the typical hero of a lady's military novel. He has the person of an Adonis, with a mind of marvellous refinement and an extraordinary range of culture. His weakness seems to be some lack of common sense, otherwise he would have at once sold out of the regiment, and turned his remarkable talents to statesmanship or the very highest walks of literature. As it is, he is content to stick fast to the pipeclay, bearing himself towards his brother officers with a superciliously contemptuous demeanour, which, as we should fancy, in actual life would have made his position absolutely unendurable. As it is, they positively like being snubbed, and respect him all the more for his sternness and sarcasm, till a kindly word tossed to a subaltern adds several inches morally to that youngster's stature. As he might have turned the heads of all the women had he pleased, so Temple had grappled the writer of these reminiscences to him with hooks of steel on a first introduction; and, with a most ingenious touch of self-glorification, the doctor tells how the agreeable impression was mutual. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the somewhat repulsive charm of this swaggering king of men, we suspect it was with mixed feelings that the members of the mess must have heard of the accident which ended fatally, though it cast a blighting shadow on the lives of Mrs. Armytage and his *fides Achates*. In fact, "Mrs. Armytage" is a romantic tale that could only have been written by a lady; and Captain Temple about as nearly resembles the best type of the educated soldier as the simpering head in a hairdresser's window resembles one of the hairdresser's more intellectual customers.

In "John Dalton's Story" we have another medical man for the narrator. But this time it is a civilian who falls in love, in equally painful circumstances, but with better fortune, with an interesting girl whose "hair was brown (with warm lights)," and who had "wistful, golden-brown eyes" to match. As for the stories which follow that of Mr. John Dalton, they are even slighter, more spasmodical, and more conventional than the rest; but we have reserved to the last a notice of "Lottie," since it really contains much that is clever. It is true that Lottie also has "a pale, small-featured face set in bronze hair," a face with a pair of bronze-brown eyes to match the hair; but that we must put up with, as also with the spun gold of her baby sister, and the blue-grey eyes of Dick Godfrey, her handsome lover. Doubtless, if the author had recollected that a miscellaneous collection of stories almost compels the critic to collate tricks of description, she would not have so ludicrously confounded the grotesque and the picturesque, but would have coloured the eyes and hair of her men, women, and children more naturally. As it is, if she had been travelling over the hair-markets of the world for Mr. Truefitt during the composition of her tales, she could hardly have filled her mind more full of one irrepressible fancy. But Lottie of the moderator-lamp-coloured locks is really a taking little personage, nor do we wonder at Dick Godfrey falling in love with her, though she was far from being eligible in point of family. She relates in bright, conversational style, and in an amusing yet pathetic manner, how she plays mother to a small family of younger brothers and sisters, who have been thrown on her hands by the illness of her mother and the recklessness of her disreputable father. She tells how she is at once the schoolmistress and playmate of these boisterous but affectionate little folks; how she manages, with much thought and anxiety, to mend their rags and satisfy their appetites, and how, in spite of maintaining tolerably rigid discipline, she is nevertheless adored by them all, down to the infant darling and the dog. As for the dog, he is by many degrees the finest character in the story, and consequently in the three volumes. "Kaspar is a Dachshund, grave of countenance, with a brow wrinkled like that of an old, old man, . . . with a tail that is capable of as much and as varied expression as most people's countenances." And there is a very moving picture of Kaspar's behaviour when his chosen playmate, "baby Maude," is supposed to be dying; as of the almost unseemly demonstrations of joy to which he delivered himself when celebrating the happy occasion of his friend appearing again to feed her pigeons. Saving for some hysterically sentimental passages which might have been advantageously omitted, although they are unfortunately in harmony with many similar

scenes in the volumes, the story of Lottie's passion for Dick is very prettily and artlessly told, from the early moment when she mentions, with characteristic frankness, that she was as much in love with him as with her baby sister. And we are glad to be able to praise anything honestly in a book that is written, after all, by the author of that very clever story, *Aunt Hepzibah's Foundling*; and towards whom we must still feel hopefully grateful for possible pleasures to come.

TURKISH LIFE IN WAR TIME.*

THIS is a very readable book. The events of which it treats are not altogether recent, and by this time the world is pretty familiar with the story of Turkish maladministration—the short-comings and worse of the governing, the wretchedness of the governed, classes. Nevertheless, this record by an intelligent eyewitness of the daily life of Constantinople during the stirring period of the war of 1877-8 is often particularly interesting, as well as amusing. The author, an American, speaks Turkish well enough to allow of his arguing with arrogant pashas in their own tongue; and, as he associated with all sorts of people, he was able to pick up a good deal of information concerning the real state of feeling in the capital at various critical junctures. Those who have travelled in Spain know how everything that goes wrong or is out of joint, from non-payment of foreign bondholders down to doors that won't shut and wheels that will creak, is thought to be satisfactorily accounted for to the inquiring stranger by the exclamation "Cosas de España!" But Turkish *cosas* leave those of Spain far behind. In the latter country, at least, people will allow that men are always more or less responsible for the good or bad administration of affairs, the morality of society, the condition of the military services, &c.; but in Turkey the responsibility of man is so liable to be swamped by the sudden initiative of Providence that there is no telling at what moment he may find himself relieved of his discriminating faculties. In so far as vivid recognition of the possible intervention of Providence in the management of their concerns tends, as it does, to promote among the masses patience, docility, and obedience to law, its operation produces results which Mr. Gladstone would find it hard to match, or even to approach, among the majority of his Christian *protégés* in the East; but there is nothing more disgusting than the combination, so often seen among the ruling classes, of a religious faith loudly expressed with the systematic practice of extortion, cruelty, and downright robbery. In a minor degree, however, and in a queer shape, this combination is seen elsewhere than in Turkey. "What are the negroes like?" the present writer asked lately of a friend returned from a small island in the West Indies. "Well," he replied, "they are extraordinarily pious; nothing delights them so much as preaching, praying, and singing psalms; but there is one thing they can't stand—and that is the Ten Commandments!"

The author of this book moved, as we have said, a good deal in mixed society, and he gives several striking instances of the state of feeling existing between the Turks and the mixed races living under their rule. "The custom of dissimulation in the presence of Turks is an incident to the condition of the subject races. It often serves to develop the special characteristics of the various races." A Turk of rank enters a public place where gentlemen of other nationalities are present, and he is received with every mark of respect. Armenians are so anxious to be on the right side that they "continually garnish with exclamations of approval the unfinished sentences of the Turk." Greeks please the great man better by their self-assertion the while that they feed him with subtle flatteries. Bulgarians remain respectfully silent unless addressed. Jews "point the remarks of the Turk with quaint bits of Oriental wisdom." The great man rises and takes his leave, on which all with a look that is equivalent to a wink gaze at each other in silence. Then the Armenian says, "What an ass that fellow is!" "Yes," responds the Greek, "a good-hearted fellow, but a fool." The Bulgarian merely shrugs his shoulders. The Jew pictures to himself the wrath he will excite in the Turk when he privately repeats to him the remarks of these gentlemen. Yet his desire to harmonize with his environment leads him sententiously to say, "A Turk is a Turk, and you can't make a man of him!"

This volume gives us so many melancholy stories concerning the effects of the vicious system of corruption and intrigue at work through every grade of the Turkish official hierarchy, that it is a relief to be allowed occasionally to see the pashas in comedy. There is something delicious in the *Cabinet communiqué* to the official journal of the Empire, to wit, that "recent discoveries in science show that the eclipse of the moon has nothing to say to the war, and no unfavourable deductions are to be drawn therefrom." A comet also appeared that year which was so fortunate as to secure the commendation of the Government. It was felt, however, that, notwithstanding official approval, the people might not be indisposed to see the last of these celestial phenomena, and they are therefore permitted to beat drums and tootoms in order to hasten their departure—in the case of the eclipse "in order to hasten its termination." There is nothing very surprising to those who recall the famous "quarries of Jaumont" into which Count Palkao hurled, by anticipation, the German armies in the war of 1870, in

finding how persistently the Turkish Government endeavoured to humbug the public and make them believe that all was going on well against the Russians. Even when the truth could no longer be entirely concealed, the official announcement of disaster was always accompanied by consoling, if not invigorating, reflections. The largest monitor of the Danube flotilla was blown up by a Russian shell, and the fact is thus proclaimed:—"The Russian steam launches drew near, and may God defend the remaining ships of our fleet! A torpedo of the kind called a fish struck the ironclad, and exercised an influence upon her stern which caused her to sink. This sad event was doubtless necessary, having been decreed of the Almighty, who, however, follows defeat by victory." When the Russians crossed the Danube, "this trivial occurrence was completely ignored by the Government"; and, instead, an announcement was made that in an obscure place in Bosnia the "victory-bearing troops of His Imperial Majesty have by the grace of God killed three Bosnian rebels, and captured one horse, three revolvers, one knife, and a waterproof overcoat!"

To make things pleasant for the Sultan seems to constitute the whole duty of man in Turkey. No autocrat is so completely hedged in by people anxious to keep him in happy ignorance of everything he ought to know. Were it not for the foreign Ambassadors, who occasionally get him to themselves and tell him home truths, it would be next to impossible for a Sultan to know for certain what is going on in his Empire. Lord Beaconsfield used to insist, and with great justice, that much allowance should be made for a man in the Sultan's peculiar position, and especially in the case of a sovereign like the present ruler, who does contrive somehow to show that, if he cannot succeed in creating a wise and just administration, it is not for lack of good intentions, up to a certain point, on his part. The reigning Sultan is by no means as dull or as easily befooled as were some of his predecessors. When Suleiman Pasha was in command at the Shipka Pass, it occurred to the Sultan to ask by telegraph if the men were well housed in the then very severe weather. "Thanks be to God," replied Suleiman, "all the soldiers are housed and are comfortable in spite of the severe weather, for under the shadow of the Sultan they have everything, and are occupied with prayers for long life to His Majesty." Whether the Sultan had suspicions of the general, or doubts as to the amount of protection afforded by his own shadow, he condescended to request information in a little more detail, and at length, by continuous telegraphing, elicited the facts in the case. "None of the sheepskins," avowed this commander so remarkably solicitous for the comfort of his men, "have yet been made up for the troops; the soldiers are doing duty amid snow and ice, but are clad only in the ragged remains of the clothing served out to them last June at the beginning of the campaign in Montenegro. Shoes and stockings ought to be sent on at once in quantity sufficient to supply at least the men who stand on picket." We doubt very much whether a British army, under similar circumstances, would be entirely engrossed with "offering prayers for long life" to their sovereign. It is not perhaps generally known that the credit of the manoeuvre which conducted Osman Pasha to Plevna is due largely to the Sultan's own initiative. The War Department had in the first instance accepted Osman's plan of leaving a garrison in Widdin, while with the bulk of his army he should take the field in Bulgaria. But later it was feared that Widdin would be sacrificed in consequence of such a movement, and orders were given that Osman should remain there. Then the Sultan interfered, and himself ordered Osman to leave Widdin, directing him to occupy Orkhanié so as to cover Sophia. "Hasten," he telegraphs, "for the Empire hangs between life and death." It was in pursuance of these orders, as shown by the official correspondence, that Osman reached Plevna in time to receive and repulse the Russian first attack. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the Sultan's infatuated regard for Suleiman Pasha was one of the main causes of Turkish disaster in the field. In connexion with the Sultan's shadow the author has an amusing anecdote. He was walking one day in the palace gardens, and, the sun being very powerful, he hoisted his umbrella. No sooner was this perceived by one of the officials than he came up and courteously requested that the umbrella might be closed, "since," said he, "it is not right that it should be supposed the shadow of the Sultan is not sufficient for all."

In every department of the State, in society, the army, the schools, the courts of law, the attempt to introduce European modes of thought has hitherto done little else than destroy what there may have been of good in the Mohammedan system. "The Turks have copied from Europe laws, courts, and schools; but the laws do not protect, the courts do not mete justice, and the schools do not educate." And the people themselves are by no means unaware that they are more likely to be losers than gainers by even amicable contact with Europeans. We gain nothing, say they, by following your systems, while we lose the respect of our own. What good do we get from educating our children as you do yours? "I wasted," said an old Turk to the author, "ten years of my life in one of the High Schools. In consequence of this I know nothing. Had I gone to the schools of the Softas I might have become a great teacher. A High School teaches nothing that people want to know. For instance, they teach botany. They spend weeks in explaining to a young man that a rose is a rose! What earthly use is that to any one? If a man knows a rose when he sees it, he knows it without having learned it in a book. If he does not know that it is a rose, no book will

ever make him care to know what it is. High Schools never did good to anybody in this country." "The Turk," adds the writer, "was partly right. As in everything else, so in education, the methods adopted by the Turks are mere spurious imitations of what is found in Europe, and always remain unmeaning forms of exercise, a weariness to both teacher and scholar."

It is customary to talk as if Asia Minor were a sort of limbo to which Turks may be safely and justly relegated. There is an idea that, if once the succession to Constantinople could be peacefully arranged, and the present holders were to cross the Bosphorus "bag and baggage," the latter might for ever thereafter be left to themselves, to do as they listed, except perhaps in the Armenian corner of Asia:—

This [says the author, very truly] is a fallacy in every way. Europe will not have got rid of the necessity of supervision over Turks after they are shipped to Asia. Asiatic Turkey is a country which the world cannot afford to give over to mismanagement. It has the scenery of Switzerland, the mineral waters of Germany, and a climate and soil of which the farmer may demand anything. Cotton grows in Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia. Rice grows in every part of the lowlands. Tobacco of fine quality is found everywhere. Silk is produced in Mesopotamia and northern Syria. Coffee, gums, and spices grow in Arabia. Olives give a great oil trade to Syria and western Asia Minor. The vineyards of every part of the country, with skilled labour, could rival those of France. The plains of Asia Minor are yellow with grain, which is raised so easily that it pays farmers to give one half of their crops for transporting the remainder to the coast. The mountains are the summer pasture of vast flocks of sheep. In central Asia Minor are mines of silver and copper. Iron and coal skirt the coast of the Black Sea. Deposits of glass-sand, emery, merschau, mines of manganese and lead, await enterprise and capital.

European enterprise is already stretching out a finger towards these hidden treasures; commerce is busily proceeding between the southern ports of Europe and those of Asiatic Turkey; the half-sentimental, half-practical interest taken by Christians of various nationalities in the condition of their brethren in Asia tends to grow rather than diminish; so that the Turk can have but little hope that even his expulsion from Constantinople will save him from continuing to be an object of European interest.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

THE chief defect of Herr Fritz Krauss's very interesting volume on Shakspeare's autobiographic confessions (1) is that it is too subjective. It is composed under the influence of preconceived ideas respecting the poet's character which go far to disable the writer from seeing more than one side of the question, and which have themselves been too hastily taken up. His very zeal for the poet's good name should have made him cautious how he staked the latter upon a questionable hypothesis. If, his argument runs, the sonnets are autobiographical, Shakspeare's moral character cannot be defended. But Shakspeare's morality must have been worthy of his intellectual greatness. Therefore, the Sonnets are not autobiographical, and can only be explained as compositions penned at the request, and relating to the affairs, of his friends Lord Southampton and Lord Pembroke. The greater part refer to Southampton's attachment to Elizabeth Vernon; the remainder are principally ironical, and designed to assist Pembroke in getting rid of his passion for Lady Rich. This is in the main the hypothesis so ingeniously worked out by Mr. Gerald Massey, to whom Herr Krauss fully acknowledges his obligations. In his own hands it suffers equally from the strength of his zeal for Shakspeare's fair fame and from the fact that his apprehensions for it rest upon a fallacy. There is nothing necessarily discreditable to Shakspeare in the autobiographic theory of the Sonnets. If his marriage was unhappy, it does not follow that the fault was his. If he erred and repented, he was not singular in the first respect, though he may have been in the second, and the vehemence of his self-reproach is less an argument for the obliquity of his conduct than for the sensitiveness of his conscience. There is thus really no occasion for the strong prepossessions which blind Herr Krauss to the enormous psychological improbability of compositions so instinct with passion as the majority of the Sonnets having been written to the order of a friend, as a barrister composes a speech for a client. This improbability, to our mind, outweighs the internal evidence elicited by the ingenuity of Mr. Massey, and further developed, as regards the Pembroke-Rich part of the hypothesis, by Herr Krauss's careful examination of the writings of Lady Rich's former admirer, Sir Philip Sidney. It is, on the contrary, our conviction that Shakspeare's more purely imaginative writings frequently abdicate his personal feelings and domestic circumstances, and this belief is confirmed by a recent most interesting discovery, the significance of which has not, so far as we are aware, been hitherto pointed out. Mr. Halliwell has lately ascertained that in 1609 proceedings were taken in the ecclesiastical Court with reference to aspersions on the chastity of Shakspeare's married daughter, Susanna Hall. Now, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*, two out of the three of Shakspeare's plays which turn upon groundless jealousy, were written in 1609 or 1610. It is impossible to doubt that we have here the key to them, and that the character and situation of Shakspeare's daughter are idealized in Imogen and Hermione. Whether Dr. Hall is represented in Posthumus and Leontes we will not pronounce; but

(1) *Shakspeare's Selbstbekenntnisse. Nach zum Theil noch unbenutzten Quellen.* Von Fritz Krauss. Weimar: Huschke. London: Williams & Norgate.

Shakspeare must have thought of himself when he made Hermione exclaim:—

The Emperor of Russia was my father ;
O that he were alive, and here beholding
His daughter's trial ; that he did but see
The flatness of my misery ; yet with eyes
Of pity, not revenge !

The discovery casts a touching light on Shakspeare's affection for his daughter, already surmised to have been his favourite child, and indicates that, like Goethe, he was accustomed to liberate himself from the impression of painful and mortifying circumstances by embodying them in an imaginative form. It is improbable that this should have no application to the Sonnets, to all appearance the most subjective and purely personal of his writings.

The essays on divers points connected with Goethe (2) which have for some years past been appearing in various periodicals with the signature of Adolf Schöll now appear collected in a handsome volume. Their principal characteristic is thoroughness, associated with the heaviness and prolixity which seem inseparable from the conscientiousness of a German critic. This heaviness, however, is rather in the style than the matter, and they are not unduly abstruse. In a really valuable essay, for instance, on one of the least known of Goethe's works—the *Pandora*—the writer supports his interpretation of this beautiful but obscure poem by constant references to the external circumstances of Goethe's life at the time, by which his argument is both enlivened and confirmed. Another important essay is long one on Goethe as a statesman and man of business; which reads, however, like an amalgamation of several disquisitions that might more advantageously have been kept apart. The essays, indeed, are almost always too long. The title of one of the best of them, "Goethe und kein Ende," seems applicable to them all. A notice of Lewes's biography of Goethe is characteristic of the peculiar standpoint of German criticism. The writer is evidently annoyed that the only Life of Goethe which has as yet attained a European reputation should be the work of a foreigner, and thinks he has demolished Lewes by convicting him of some inaccuracies, which is no difficult matter. Out of Germany, however, a book which does not interest, but only informs, is hardly regarded as belonging to literature. There are numerous German lives of Goethe as much more accurate than Lewes's as they are more voluminous; but one opens them as one opens a dictionary, and they have just as much claim to be accounted literature. They are not biographies, but the materials of biography. If the biography of Goethe is not made as interesting as a novel, it has not received justice; and until some German arises capable of doing it this justice, the Englishman will continue to be criticized, for he will continue to be read.

Alexander Braun (3) was one of the first of European botanists, who devoted a long life, with rare industry and single-mindedness, to the pursuit of his special science, and contributed greatly to enrich it, especially in the departments of vegetable morphology and fossil botany. It is not very surprising that his daughter's biography of him, notwithstanding the assistance she states herself to have received from her brother-in-law, should altogether fail to render justice to his character in its scientific aspect. No clear comprehension of the work of Braun's life is to be gained from it, and it must prove a great disappointment to botanical readers. On the other hand, his life had a rich human side, and to this Mme. Mettenius has been better qualified to render justice. A more engaging character has rarely been depicted—simple, disinterested, unassuming, yet enthusiastic in his devotion to science, and a model of tenderness and warmth in all domestic and social relations. These were not always fortunate; his life was saddened by the death of his first wife and of several children, and yet more by his estrangement from his early friend and associate, the botanist Schimper, occasioned mainly by the rupture of the latter's engagement to Braun's sister. Schimper, Braun, and Agassiz had formed a brotherhood in the days of their youth; but, although two at least out of the three attained the highest distinction as men of science, Braun was compelled to acknowledge in their old age that the hopes based upon their co-operation had been unfulfilled. Braun's letters to his friends and relatives are always interesting, and give a vivid as well as a pleasing image of the man; but they rarely turn on scientific matters, and contain little to redeem Mme. Mettenius's omission to portray the botanist. Some extracts, however, from a lecture delivered late in life characterize his attitude towards the Darwinian theory, which, unlike his friend Agassiz, he accepted as far as regarded the admission of the principle of evolution. He considers, however, the doctrine of natural selection entirely inadequate to account by itself for the multiplicity and variety of organized existence, and objects to Haeckel and the extreme Darwinians that their speculations leave no room for the presiding idea without which systematic evolution is incomprehensible. On the one hand, "the higher animals, including man, could no more have arisen without connexion with the lower than flowers and fruits could have come into being without stems and branches." On the other hand, "a mechanical explanation is no explanation, for mechanism is never a cause, but always a means to an end."

(2) *Goethe in Hauptzügen seines Lebens und Wirkens.* Gesammelte Abhandlungen von Adolf Schöll. Berlin: Hertz. London: Williams & Norgate.

(3) *Alexander Braun's Leben.* Nach seinem handschriftlichen Nachlass dargestellt von C. Mettenius. Berlin: Reimer. London: Williams & Norgate.

A new Life of Christ (4), by Bernhard Weiss, already distinguished as a New Testament critic, is, like most German works so entitled, rather an examination of the Gospel narrative than a biography. Its publication is nevertheless justified by the independence of the author's point of view, which appears not so much in any marked originality of treatment as in a sobriety and moderation contrasting favourably with the sweeping style of most of the German theologians who have undertaken to rewrite the Evangelical history. His principles of criticism are much the same as theirs, but he finds these compatible with the acceptance of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. He is strongly opposed to the habit of the Tübingen school of criticism of reading tendencies into the simple writings of the Evangelists and detecting a dogmatic purpose beneath every trifling variation, and no less so to the assumption that the Gospels date from the second century. The original Matthew, he thinks, was published about 67; Mark about 69; Matthew, in its present form, about 73; Luke about 80. These preliminary matters disposed of, the author proceeds to the biographical portion of his work, which partakes, however, rather of the character of exegesis than of biography. His minuteness may occasionally appear tedious, but there is always abundance of substance, and his discussion of controversial points will always repay attention. Although professedly orthodox on the subject of miracles, his attitude is not very decided, and what he maintains in appearance he frequently concedes in effect. The first volume comes down to the end of the first period of Christ's Galilean ministry; the second will complete the work.

Dr. Bastian's work on Buddhist psychology (5) displays all his usual erudition, but even more than his usual want of method and system. He makes no attempt to classify or sift the multifarious information he has collected, far less to elaborate it into a treatise. The sequence of his observations seems purely capricious, and there is never any telling into what remote region we may be whisked off by some interesting but irrelevant citation. His work can only be regarded as a commonplace book from which useful notes may be gleaned by the students of Buddhism and many other things.

The form and dimensions of books (6) must in all ages have stood in a certain relation to their contents, and exerted a certain influence upon the latter. The literature of an age of octavos, for example, must differ from that of an age when folios were the preponderating form; and we see every day books that have originally passed through magazines modified in deference to the exigencies of this class of publication. Herr Birt investigates the forms assumed by books among the ancients, and their influence in adapting literature to the taste and convenience of the public. Down to the third century, when his researches terminate, he finds papyrus the only material, and the roll the only form. The length, therefore, of the book or corresponding division of an extensive treatise depended greatly upon the dimensions found suitable for the distinct roll, which were in their turn conditioned by the convenience of the reader. Having established this principle, Herr Birt proceeds to institute the most minute and elaborate investigations into the usual number of leaves or pages in a roll; the height, width, and average contents of a column; the differences between rolls of Greek and of Latin text, rolls of prose and rolls of verse, the remuneration of copyists, the quality and manufacture of paper, publishers and booksellers, libraries public and private, and other kindred topics. There is also a section on books of the pre-Alexandrian period; and a very interesting one on the displacement of papyrus as a writing material by parchment, about the fifth century.

Herr Marczali's investigation of the sources of Hungarian history under the Arpad dynasty (7) is a prize essay crowned by the Hungarian Academy. It has evident recommendations in its clearness, conciseness, and impartiality. The native authorities for Hungarian history have, Herr Marczali thinks, been too indiscriminately accepted by his countrymen, and too sweepingly discredited by German critics. He divides them into four classes—ecclesiastical legends, chronicles, annals, and monographs—and analyses the principal works in each. A second part discusses the notices of Hungarian affairs by foreign historians, principally Byzantine and German.

Anglia (8) continues to be a storehouse of interesting relics of English mediæval literature. The most valuable contributions to the last number are Occlée's expostulation with Sir John Oldcastle on his Lollardism, edited from a MS. in the late Sir Thomas Phillips's collection, by Miss L. Toulmin Smith; and Bishop Bale's "Comedy concerning thre Lawes," reprinted from an exceedingly rare German edition by A. Sciaroer. Occlée's poem is very curious for its quaint erudition and sturdy conservatism, but has little poetical merit. Bale's miracle-play, on the other hand, the interlocutors in which are personified virtues and vices, is a powerful though virulent attack upon the Papacy, well calculated to answer its purpose.

(4) *Das Leben Jesu.* Von Bernhard Weiss. Bd. 1. Berlin: Hertz. London: Williams & Norgate.

(5) *Der Buddhismus in seiner Psychologie.* Von A. Bastian. Berlin: Dümmler. London: Williams & Norgate.

(6) *Das Antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur.* Von Theodor Birt. Berlin: Hertz. London: Williams & Norgate.

(7) *Ungarns Geschichtsquellen im Zeitalter der Árpáden.* Von H. Marczali. Berlin: Hertz. London: Williams & Norgate.

(8) *Anglia. Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie.* Herausgegeben von R. P. Wueicker. Bd. 5. Hft. 1. Halle: Niemeyer. London: Nutt.

The exquisite metrical forms of the Troubadours (9) would render their poetry an interesting object of study, even if it possessed no other merit. In fact, a considerable part of it is far from corresponding with our preconceived ideas of Southern passion and romance. Dr. Brinckmeier, in his pleasing little volume on the subject, points out that this must necessarily arise from the fact that the minstrels were commonly either themselves men of rank and station, or the followers of such persons, and that their writings on public affairs inevitably took the shape of poems, inasmuch as, in a generally illiterate age, the poetical was the only literary form admitting of general dissemination. Their *airventes*, in fact, supplied the place of pamphlets and leading articles. With a large element of affectation and unreality, their erotic poetry contains much genuine passion. Perhaps the most favourable examples of their talent are the narrative poems in which emotion is blended with light persiflage, as in Arnaud de Caramesse's half-Eastern tale of the parrot, of which Dr. Brinckmeier has rendered the greater part. He has given numerous other translations, and it is no slight praise to say that the charm of the intricately rhymed and delicately phrased original has not entirely evaporated in his honest prose.

Miss Amy Fay (10) is an American young lady, whose experience as a student of music in Germany, communicated in letters to her family, affords material for an entertaining little book. Her studies, which attained the desired end of transforming a promising amateur into an accomplished professional, were pursued chiefly at Weimar and Berlin, under the successive direction of the nervous and capricious Tausig; the painstaking but sarcastic Kullak; Liszt, despotic, but less pretentious than many lesser men, and Deppe, whom she regards as the best teacher of all. Tausig swore by Chopin, Liszt by Beethoven, Deppe by Mozart. Liszt's "regal attitudes" are gently satirized; but, on the whole, he seems to have succeeded in winning his pupil's affection and respect.

Professor Westerkamp's eulogium upon English national institutions in the current number of the *Rundschau* (11) is indeed very flattering to our national pride, but we could almost wish that he had chosen another opportunity for delivering it. German readers, turning from the Professor to the papers, will find it no easy matter to reconcile the two. Professor Haeckel's letters from Ceylon are more graphic and spirited than his Indian letters, and, in fact, depict the luxuriance of tropical nature with much felicity. How far science may have profited from the Professor's pleasant outing remains to be ascertained. There is a thoughtful criticism on Gottfried Keller, distinguishing between the German and Swiss elements of his literary character; with an account of a Russian "Pictor Ignotus," Iwanow, whose life reminds us of the artistic tragedies which have afforded subjects to Balzac and Mr. Henry James. Iwanow, who resided at Rome, devoted his life to the execution of a single great picture upon a religious subject. During the prosecution of his work his views changed; he lost his original ideal without finding another, and, enfeebled by moral and material disappointments, succumbed to an attack of cholera. His anonymous biographer regards him as a type of the perverse development of the Russian intellect from Byzantinism through realism into Nihilism.

(9) *Die provenzalischen Troubadours als lyrische und politische Dichter. Mit Proben ihrer Dichtungen.* Von Dr. E. Brinckmeier. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. London: Williams & Norgate.

(10) *Musikstudien in Deutschland.* Aus Briefen die Heimath von Amy Fay. Mit Erlaubniß der Verfasserin in's Deutsche übertragen. Berlin: Oppenheim. London: Nutt.

(11) *Deutsche Rundschau.* Herausgegeben von Julius Rodenberg. Jahrg. viii. Hft. 9. Berlin: Paetel. London: Williams & Norgate.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 4d., or \$7 58 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, Mr. DAVID JONES, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 4 Trafalgar Square, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday by M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,390, JUNE 17, 1882:

Egypt. Ireland.

Prince Bismarck. Parliamentary Questions.
The Elections in Belgium. The Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.
The Movement of American Population. The Status of French Judges.
The Salvation Army.

The Eclipse. Cairo.

Sir Ashley Eden and the Government of Bengal.
A Champagne Ring. Doctors and Local Legislation. Religious Processions.
M. Léon Say's Predictions. The Operas.
Ascot Races.

Three Handbooks of English History.

Yonge on Oliver Goldsmith. A History of Shorthand.
A Prodigal's Progress. The Antiquary. Tunis under the French.
Rivers and Canals. Towns on Scholasticism. Lady Deane.
Turkish Life in War Time. German Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,389, JUNE 10, 1882:

The Prevention of Crime Bill—Egypt—Garibaldi—The Government and Ireland—The First Reform Bill—American Diplomacy and the Panama Canal—The French Republic and the Archbishops—Eton—Continuous Brakes and London Houses—Loans to Working-Men.

"Uncommon Nonsense about Many Things"—A Sketch of Cardinal Newman—Silly Societies—Cattle-Farming—Théophile Gautier's Pets—The Strike in the American Iron Trade—Sculpture in 1882—The Operas—June Racing.
Pollock's Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics—Kaffir Folk-Lore—The American Irish—Indian Outfits—For Love and Honour—White on Naval Architecture—Eau-de-Nil—The Growth of English Industry and Commerce—Joseph's Coat—Harkness's Latin Grammar—Minor Notices.

London : Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

BIRMINGHAM MUSICAL FESTIVAL, 1882. AUGUST 29, 30, 31, and SEPTEMBER 1.

NEW ORATORIO, "BEDENPTION."
Composed expressly for this Festival by M. GOÜNOD.

NEW CANTATA, "PSYCHE,"

By Herr GADE.

NEW CANTATA, "GRAZIELLA,"

By Sir JULIUS BENEDICT.

NEW CANTATA, "THE HOLY CITY,"

By A. R. GAUL.

NEW ORCHESTRAL WORK,

By VILLIERS STANFORD.

MARCHE NUPTIALE, by GOÜNOD.

Composed for the Marriage of the Duke of Albany.

Principal Artists: Madame ALBANI, Miss ANNA WILLIAMS, and Madame MARIE ROZE; Madame PATEY and Madame TREBELL; Mr. EDWARD LLOYD and Mr. MAAKS; Mr. SANTLEY, Mr. F. KING, and Signor POLL.

Conductor—Sir MICHAEL COSTA.

BAND AND CHORUS OF 500 PERFORMERS.

OUTLINE PROGRAMMES on application to 36 Waterloo Street, Birmingham.

THE GROSVENOR GALLERY.

SUMMER EXHIBITION.

Now Open, from Nine till Seven.

Admission, One Shilling. Season Tickets, Five Shillings.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 33 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

A RUNDÉL SOCIETY.—CHROMO-LITHOGRAPHS, from Works of Old Masters representing in their proper colours various Pictures by Giotto, Fra Angelico, Perugino, Mantegna, etc. The Pictures are in the style of the old Masters. Pictures by Van Eyck, Memling, Albert Dürer, Holbein, &c., are sold to the public as well as to members, at prices varying from 10s. to 4s. Priced Lists of all the publications of the Society, with particulars of Membership, will be sent post free on application at 34 Old Bond Street, London, W.

F. LAMBE PRICE, Secretary.

WATER-COLOUR DRAWINGS, by Mr. AYSCOUGH WILKINSON, ON VIEW at Messrs. BARNARD'S GALLERY, 235 Oxford Street, from 12th to end of June. Sketches in Italy, North Wales, London, &c. Admission free on presentation of address card.

REPTON SCHOOL DINNER.—Monday, June 26, at St. James's Hall. Past members who intend to be present are requested to send their names either to W. N. STURT, India Office, or to S. CASSAN PAUL, 32 South Eaton Place, London, S.W.

ROSSALL SCHOOL.—ELEVEN ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS will be competed for June 27. Value from 70 Guineas (covering school fees) to £200. Age of Juniors 14; Seniors 18. Candidates may be examined at Oxford or Rossall, as preferred, in Classics or Mathematics.—Apply to Rev. the HEAD-MASTER, Rossall School, Fleetwood.

TONBRIDGE SCHOOL.—EXAMINATION for SIX SCHOLARSHIPS, Classical or Modern, Value from £67 a year, on July 27. Age under Fifteen.—Apply to the REV. T. B. ROWE, Head-master.

SOMERSETSHIRE COLLEGE, BATH.—Head-Master—T. M. BROMLEY, M.A. JUNIOR DEPARTMENT, at which BOYS are received from Seven to Fourteen years of age, Juniors 14, Seniors 18. An Examination for Entrance Scholarships will be held on Wednesday and Thursday, July 12 and 13.—For Prospectus and further information apply to the SECRETARY.

HIGHGATE SCHOOL.—There will be an EXAMINATION for SIX FOUNDATION (of which three are Entrance) SCHOLARSHIPS of £24 per annum, July 5 and 6. Further particulars on application to the Rev. C. McDOWELL, D.D., Schoolhouse, Highgate, N.

M A L V E R N C O L L E G E .
The NEXT TERM begins Friday, September 22. Entrance Examination, 9 A.M.—
For particulars, apply to HENRY ALDRICH, Esq., Secretary.

STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL,
founded by the Rev. J. D. COLLIS, D.D.—The Warden is assisted by seven Resident Masters, two being specially for Modern Languages. Classical and Modern Sides. Special preparation for the Universities, Army, Navy, all Competitive Examinations, and for Cantab. Lit. JUNIOR DEPARTMENT for YOUNG BOYS, and for Advantages for Girls, who are given a large gymnasium, Gymnastic, phys. & field, &c. &c. References permitted to the Parents of all present Pupils. Inclusive Terms, 60 and 70 Guineas.—Apply to the WARDEN.

M I L I T A R Y E D U C A T I O N I N G E R M A N Y .
Colonel BERDOE WILKINSON, late R.E., and Lieut.-Colonel WILKINSON SHAW, M.A., late Garrison Instructor at Aldershot, prepare GENTLEMEN for the ARMY through Sandhurst, or through the MILITARY COLLEGE.

Having increased their Civil staff, they can also now receive Candidates for the Universities. Special arrangements made for Staff College or Army promotion examinations. Nine pupils passed at the recent Sandhurst and Militia Literary examinations. Fifteen Militia pupils obtained Line commissions from the last two competitions—nine in September, 1881, and six in March, 1882.

Address, Darmstadt, Germany.

FOLKESTONE. — Mr. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. Oxon., assisted by a Cambridge M.A. and competent Teachers, prepares PUPILS for the Universities, Woolwich, Sandhurst, and all Competitive Examinations. A few Vacancies.

HALLIFORD HOUSE SCHOOL, SHEPPERTON, near London. HENRY ST. CLAIR FEILDEN, B.A. (C.C.C. Oxford. Double Honour), and MALCOLM HEARD, B.A. (C.C.C. Oxford. Double Honour), late Assistant-Master at Seabright, PREPARE BOYS for the Public Schools. Terms, £120.—For Prospectus and references, apply to H. ST. CLAIR FEILDEN, Esq., Halliford, Middlesex.

E D U C A T I O N . — A LADY, living at Norwood, receives SIXTEEN PUPILS, all daughters of Gentlemen. The work of the School is thorough, and the instruction such as will be useful to the Pupils in society and after life. Her aim is general culture, and such sort of proficiency in French, German, Music, Painting, Science, Literature, &c., as is desirable for Ladies not intended for marriage. The work is modelled with a view by a Gentleman appointed by the University of London, the papers and their results being sent to the Parents. The home comforts are great; the house large, detached, and in its own grounds. French and German Governesses live in the house, and there is a good staff of visiting London Professors. For terms, &c., apply to MADAME, at Allmann's Library, 37 New Oxford Street, London.

H I G H E R E D U C A T I O N O F W O M E N .
SOMERVILLE HALL, OXFORD.

President of the Council—Rev. J. PERCIVAL, President of Trinity College.

Principal of the Hall—Miss M. SHAW-LEFEVRE.

Additional accommodation for students to be provided by the building of a new wing, which will be opened in October next, when also two Exhibitions, tenable at the Hall, will be awarded after examination: The Clothworkers' Exhibition of £30 a year for three years; (2) An Exhibition of £2 a year for two years. Names of candidates should be sent in before October 1 to the PRINCIPAL, from whom further information can be obtained.

HEAD-MASTER REQUIRED for ALSTON COLLEGE, near Preston, Lancashire. He must be a Graduate of Oxford or Cambridge, and in Holy Orders. Salary, £200 a year, with a moderate liberal capitation fees on increase of numbers. Applications, in testimonials, to be sent, on or before June 20, to A. W. HEWITT, Esq., 28 Golden Square, London, W.

F I R E R I S K , &c., O F E L E C T R I C L I G H T I N G .

M R. MUSGRAVE HEAPHY, C.E., Consulting Engineer to the PHENIX FIRE OFFICE, can be consulted professionally by all who contemplate using the ELECTRIC LIGHT. Mr. HEAPHY will advise as to the most suitable and economical light, supervise the estimates furnished by the Electric Light Companies, superintend the installation, and all matters connected therewith, giving special attention to FIRE RISK and DANGER.—Address, 19 Lombard Street, London, E.C.

P.S.—For account of Mr. HEAPHY's Report upon "Electric Lighting and Rules necessary for Safety," see "Times," May 10, "Electrician," May 13, "Journal of Arts," May 5, "Insurance Guardian," April 28, and most of the leading papers in England.

T O BE LET, FURNISHED, for a long or short term, at a very Moderate Rent, No. 35 CATHCART ROAD, South Kensington, containing Drawing, and Breakfast Rooms, five Bedrooms, and good Domestic Offices.—Write to A. B., as above.

T O LET, from July 1, an excellent STUDIO, in SOUTH KENSINGTON, with Bedroom, W.C., Cellarage, &c. Rent, £75.—Apply on the Premises, 1 Stratford Avenue, Marlborough Road, S.W., or to THOMAS WEBSTER, Esq., 43 Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

DANTE G. ROSETTI.—By Order of the Executor, the DECORATIVE FURNITURE, ARTICLES OF VERTU, and EFFECTS, including a few PICTURES by Old Masters, and rare BOOKS, in the house of the late Mr. ROSETTI, 16 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, will be SOLD BY AUCTION, on the Premises; by Messrs. T. G. WHARTON, MARTIN, & CO., on Wednesday, July 5, at Twelve. Descriptive Catalogues may be obtained at the Auctioneers, 1 Basinghall Street, London, E.C.

PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

UNDER CONTRACT FOR HER MAJESTY'S MAILS TO INDIA, CHINA, and AUSTRALIA.

REDUCED RATES OF PASSAGE MONEY.—SPECIAL RETURN TICKETS.
Departures for—
BOMBAY Weekly From Gravesend,
CALCUTTA CHINCHIN, Formidably } Wednesday 12.30 P.M.
CHINA STRAITS, JAPAN From Brindisi,
ADELAIDE, MELBOURNE, SYDNEY Monday,
GIBRALTAR, MALTA, EGYPT, ADEN, Weekly, by each of the
above departures.
LONDON OFFICES: 12 LEADENHALL STREET, E.C., and
15 COCKSPUR STREET.

HOTELS.

B R I T T O N . — B E D F O R D H O T E L . — F a c i n g S e a a n d E s p a n a d o. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. BENJN. BULL, Manager.

I L F R A C O M B E . — T h e I L F R A C O M B E H O T E L , f a c i n g t h e A t l a n t i c . G r o u n d s , 5 a c r e s . T e n n i s L a w n . 250 R o o m s . T a b l e d ' h o t e l s a t s p a r e t a b l e s f r o m 6 t o 8 P.M. L a r g e S w i m m i n g B a t h . H o t , C o l d , a n d T e p i d S e a a n d F r e s h W a t e r p r i v a t e B a t h s , D o u c h e , B l o w e r , &c.—A d d r e s s , t h e M A N A G E R .

E A S T B O U R N E . — T h e G R A N D H O T E L . — S t a n d s i n s i c e o w n g r o u n d s f a c i n g t h e S e a . F i v e m i n u t e s ' d r i v e f r o m t h e R a i l w a y S t a t i o n , a n d c l o s e t o t h e D e v o n s h i r e P a r k a n d B a t h s . V i s i t o r s c a n b e b o a r d e d , i f d e s i r e d . T e r m s , 10s. 6d. p e r d a y . N o c h a r g e f o r a t t e n d a n c e . T a b l e d ' h o t e l s a t s p a r e t a b l e s f r o m 6 P.M. t o 8 P.M., u n d e r t h e p e r s o n a l s u p e r i n t e n d e n c e o f t h e n e w P r o p r i e t o r s , C L E A V E & G A S C O I N E .

H I N D L E Y ' S C H I N T Z E S .

ORIGINAL DESIGNS, FAST COLOURS.
From 9d. per yard.

Patterns sent and Estimates given.

C. H I N D L E Y & S O N S .

290 to 294 1/2 OXFORD STREET, W.

F U R N I S H Y O U R H O U S E o r A P A R T M E N T S
THROUGHOUT on MODERN HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices: no Extra Charge for the giving of Large Stock. Stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue with Terms, post free—2s, 2s, and 2s Tottenham Court Road, and 19, 20, and 21 Morwell Street, W. Established 1862.

L I F E A S S U R A N C E S , &c.

N O R T H E R N F I R E a n d L I F E A S S U R A N C E C O M P A N Y .

ESTABLISHED 1836.

HEAD OFFICES—LONDON and ABERDEEN.

Accumulated Funds, £27,08,000.

The Forty-sixth Annual General Meeting of this Company was held within their House at Aberdeen, on Friday, June 9, 1882, when the Directors' Report was adopted, and a Dividend of 20s. together with a Bonus of 10s. per Share, free of income tax, were declared, making, with the amount already paid, a total distribution of £2 10s. per Share in respect of the year 1881.

The following are extracts from the Report submitted:

F I R E D E P A R T M E N T .

The Premiums received last year again showed an increase over those of the previous year, having been £451,487 0s. 5d., as compared with £445,506 12s. 7d. in 1880.

The Losses, as in many other Offices in 1881, were heavy, and amounted to £267,556 2s. 4d., or 63 7/8 per cent. of the premiums. This ratio is higher than that of any year since 1873, and raises the general average of the Company's experience from the beginning to £21,137 10s. per cent. of the premiums.

The expenses of Management (including commission to agents and charges of every kind) came to £13,280 10s. or 30 2/3 per cent. of the premiums, a reduction of 14 per cent. compared with the previous year.

The result is that, after reverting the usual 33 per cent. of the year's premiums to cover liabilities under current policies, a profit was earned of £39,459 19s. 5d., which sum has been transferred to the credit of the General Account of Profit and Loss.

L I F E D E P A R T M E N T .

Assurance Branch.—The new Assurances during the year reached in the aggregate the sum of £495,856, of which £162,450 was for Endowment Assurances payable at death or on the attainment of a specified age. These new Assurances yielded Annual Premiums amounting to £18,033 1s. 2d., and Single Premiums amounting to £1,137 10s. 6d.

The Premiums received were £1,137 10s. 6d., and the Premiums paid were £1,137 10s. 6d.

The Claims amounted to £12,539 16s. 6d., of which the sum of £2,238 11s. 6d. was for Endowments and Endowment Assurances payable during life.

The expenses of Management (including commission) were limited to 10 per cent. of the Premiums received.

Annuity Branch.—The sum of £6,394 13s. 6d. was received for Annuities granted during the year.

O F F I C E O F G E N E R A L M A N A G E R .

Mr. E. H. Manning having resigned the service of the Company to accept an appointment in another office, the Directors have appointed Mr. VALENTINE sole General Manager.

L o n d o n B o a r d o f D i r e c t o r s .

Chairman—Sir WILLIAM MILLER, Bart.

Colonel Robert Baring, Esq. Alexander Heun Gosschen, Esq. Ernest Chaplin, Esq. Wm. Egerton Hubbard, Jun., Esq. Philip Currie, Esq., C.B. Ferdinand Marshall Huth, Esq. George John Fenwick, Esq. Henry James Lubbock, Esq. Alexander Pearson Fletcher, Esq. William Walkinshaw, Esq.

Fire Department—JAMES ROBB, Manager.

Life Department—THOMAS H. COOKE, Actuary.

General Manager—JAMES VALENTINE.

Copies of the Report, with the whole accounts of the Company for the year 1881, may be obtained from any of the Company's Offices or Agencies.

C O M M E R C I A L U N I O N A S S U R A N C E C O M P A N Y , F I R E , L I F E , M A R I N E .

Capital fully subscribed £2,500,000.

Capital paid up £250,000.

Life Funds in Special Trust for Life Policy Holders exceed £753,000.

Total Annual Premium Income exceeds £1,050,000.

Chief Offices—19 and 20 CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.

West End Offices—5 ALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

P H E N I X F I R E O F F I C E , L O M B A R D S T R E E T a n d C H A R I N G C R O S S , L O N D O N .—Established 1785.

Insurances against Loss by Fire and Lightning effected in all parts of the World.

Loss claims arranged with promptitude and liberality.

JOHN J. BROOMFIELD, Secretary.

L A W L I F E A S S U R A N C E S O C I E T Y , F l e e t S t r e e t , L o n d o n .—Established 1823.

Assets on December 31, 1881 £5,422,545.

Income for the year 1881 469,369.

Claims paid to December 31, 1881 13,910,318.

Bonuses hitherto allotted 6,198,901.

Expenses of Management, including Commission, about 4 per cent. of Income.

Rates of Premium reduced. Free Travelling Limits extended.

Leans granted on security of Policies, Life Interests, and Reversions.

Commission allowed to Solicitors and others on Assurances introduced through their agency.

Policies effected this year will participate in the Bonus on December 31, 1884.

Prospectus and Forms of Proposal sent on application to the ACTUARY.

N O R T H E R N A S S U R A N C E C O M P A N Y .—Established 1826. 1 MOORGATE STREET, LONDON.

Subscribed Capital, £3,000,000, of which paid up £300,000.

Fire Reserve Funds, £308,198.

Life Funds as per last account, £1,553,023.

L I F E A S S U R A N C E .

H E A L T H Y P E R S O N S A T A L L A G E S will find in the BONUS SYSTEMS of the LIFE ASSOCIATION of SCOTLAND advantages far exceeding what can be obtained under any of the Ordinary Systems.

See Prospectus for Specimens and Illustrations of the remarkable results.

CLAIMS AND BONUSES PAID £4,028,000.

ANNUAL REVENUE £436,000.

F O R T Y - T H R I D Y E A R .

IMMEDIATE ENTRANTS will secure

ONE YEAR'S BONUS more than last Assurers.

LONDON—3 L O W E R S T R E E T S, P A L L M A L L , S.W.

EDINBURGH—23 PRINCES STREET.

BIRMINGHAM—54 New Street.

LEEDS—14 East Parade.

LIVERPOOL—11 Tithebarn Street.

MANCHESTER—10 Bank Street.

GLASGOW—123 ST. VINCENT STREET.

S U N F I R E a n d L I F E O F F I C E S .—THREEDNEEDLE STREET, E.C. CHARING CROSS, S.W. OXFORD STREET (Corner of Vere Street), W.

FIRE. Established 1710. Home and Foreign Insurances at moderate rates.

LIFE. Established 1810. Specially low rates for young lives. Immediate settlement of claims.

R O Y A L E X C H A N G E A S S U R A N C E O F F I C E , Royal Exchange, London, June 7, 1882.

The Court of Directors of the ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE do hereby give Notice that a GENERAL COURT of the said Corporation will be held at their Office at the Royal Exchange, on Thursday, the 6th of July next, from One o'clock till Two o'clock in the Afternoon, for the election of a Governor, Sub-Governor, Vice-Governor, Deputy Governor, and that the said Court will be presided over by Adjournment, and hold at the same place, and during the same time, on Friday, the 7th of July next, for the election of Twenty-five Directors. Which Elections will be severally declared at such times as the Court shall appoint to receive the respective Returns from the Scrutinies.

E. R. HANCOCK, Secretary.

N.B.—Printed Lists of the Proprietors qualified to vote will be ready to be delivered at the Office on Saturday, the 1st day of July next.

A S S U R A N C E A G A I N S T A C C I D E N T S O F A L L K I N D S .—Assurance against Railway Accidents alone.—Assurance against Fatal Accidents at Sea.—Assurance of Employers' Liability.—Assurance against Accidents to Passengers.—Right Hon. Lord KINNAIRD, Chairman. Subscribed Capital, £1,000,000. Paid-up Capital, £100,000. Premiums, £240,000. £1,700,000 has been paid as compensation. Apply to the Clerks at the Railway Stations, the Local Agents, or 64 Cornhill, or 5 Grand Hotel Buildings, Charing Cross, London.

W. J. VIAN, Sec.

C O N V U L S I O N S i n T E E T H I N G are prevented by the use of MRS. JOHNSON'S SOOTHING SYRUP. It contains no narcotic, and gives speedy relief. See BARCLAY & SONS name on stamp. Of all Chemists, 2s. 9d. per bottle.